DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 374 029 SO 024 072

AUTHOR Angell, Ann V.
TITLE Civic Attitudes of Japanese Middle School Students: Results of a Pilot Study.
PUB DATE Nov 90
NOTE 101p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (Anaheim, CA, November 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizenship; *Citizenship Education; Cross Cultural Studies; Cultural Differences; Educational Research; Foreign Countries; Junior High Schools; *Junior High School Students; Middle Schools; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Japan; *Middle School Students

ABSTRACT

This document reports on a civics attitudes questionnaire that was piloted for the purpose of developing psychometrically sound measures of the socio-political attitudes of Japanese middle school students and climate in Japanese middle school classrooms. Studies of Japanese education have produced mixed opinions about the civic dispositions of Japanese students, but few have addressed the relationship between schooling during the formative years of middle childhood and the socio-political outcomes typically associated with citizenship education. In order to investigate this relationship, measures of both socio-political attitudes and perceptions of classroom climate used in previous cross-national studies of civics education were translated into Japanese and administered to 143 first- and third-year middle school students. Findings supported the validity and reliability of factor based scales measuring support for free expression, cynicism towards authority, political interest, active citizenship, and expected future participation. However, follow-up interviews with teachers suggested that Japanese interpretations of key concepts such as democracy, free expression, and participation differ substantially from western conceptualizations, calling into question the viability of cross-cultural comparisons on the basis of these measures. The eight appendices include: (1) civic attitudes questionnaire; (2) tolerance for diversity scale; (3) civic attitudes questionnaire for Japanese students; (4) directions for administering the questionnaire; (5) rotated factor structure of 54 attitude items; (6) attitud items retained on 6 factor based scales; (7) summary of item weaknesses and recommendations for revision; and (8) rotated factor structure of good citizen items. (Author/DK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 374 029

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Civic Attitudes of Japanese Middle School Students: Results of a Pilot Study

Ann V. Angell
Division of Educational Studies
Emory University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
ANN V. ANGELL
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council For the Social Studies, Anaheim, California. November, 1990.

SO 024 072

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Abstract

The Problem 3

Definitions 5

Survey of the Literature. 7
- Research on Political Socialization
- Research on Classroom Climate
- Cross-National Studies of Civic Attitudes
- Research on Civic Education in Japan

Methodology 16
- Sample
- Instrument
- Analysis

Results 30
- Analysis of the Attitude Statements
- Analysis of the Good Citizen Scale
- Analysis of the Participation Scale

Discussion. 42

Implications for Social Studies Educators 52

References

Footnote

Appendices
- Appendix A: Civic Attitudes Questionnaire
- Appendix B: Tolerance for Diversity Scale
- Appendix C: Civic Attitudes Questionnaire for Japanese Students
- Appendix D: Directions for Administering the Questionnaire
- Appendix E: Rotated Factor Structure -- 54 Attitude Items
- Appendix F: Attitude Items Retained on Six Factor-based Scales
- Appendix G: Summary of Item Weaknesses and Recommendations for Revision
- Appendix H: Rotated Factor Structure -- Good Citizen Items

Tables
- Table 1: Reliability Estimates for 8 Political Attitude Scales
- Table 2: Reliability Estimates for 6 Factor-based Scales
- Table 3: Independent Sample T-tests: Free Expression Scale
- Table 4: Independent Sample T-tests: Cynicism Scale
- Table 5: Independent Sample T-tests: Political Interest Scale
- Table 6: Reliability Estimates for Good Citizen Scale
- Table 7: Independent Sample T-tests: Active Citizen Scale
- Table 8: Independent Sample T-tests: Participation Scale

Abstract

A civics attitudes questionnaire was piloted for the purpose of developing psychometrically sound measures of the socio-political attitudes of Japanese middle school students and climate in Japanese middle school classrooms. Studies of Japanese education have produced mixed opinions about the civic dispositions of Japanese students, but few have addressed the relationship between schooling during the formative years of middle childhood and the socio-political outcomes typically associated with citizenship education. In order to investigate this relationship, measures of both socio-political attitudes and perceptions of classroom climate used in previous cross-national studies of civics education were translated into Japanese and administered to 143 first- and third-year middle school students. Findings supported the validity and reliability of factor-based scales measuring support for free expression, cynicism towards authority, political interest, active citizenship, and expected future participation. However, follow-up interviews with teachers suggested that Japanese interpretations of key concepts such as democracy, free expression, and participation differ substantially from western conceptualizations, calling into question the viability of cross-cultural comparisons on the basis of these measures.

The Problem

Over the last 20 years Japan's miraculous postwar recovery and surge to economic success have drawn the attention of the international community to such an extent that, in the 1980s, Japan has come to be widely regarded as the late-blooming eastern cousin of the industrialized western democracies. Observant politicians, business leaders, and educators in the west, anxious to replicate Japan's successes, are enthusiastically importing promising pieces of the miracle. Furthermore, the assumption that education must be the driving force behind Japan's extraordinary accomplishments has created a particular interest in Japanese schooling.

This interest has spurred comparisons of the academic performance of Japanese students with that of students in other countries. Reports that the achievement test scores of Japanese students are superior and that Japanese literacy rates are near 100% have fueled international interest and led many to think of Japan as a nation whose educational system is uniquely successful. While the popular media have drawn on such reports to furnish the public's imagination with a picture of Japanese high school graduates as well-educated, loyal, and disciplined workers, studies that have more closely investigated Japan's educational processes have produced mixed reviews. Indeed, some studies have raised serious questions--first, as to the accuracy

of the media image; and second, as to the nature of the goals that these outcomes reflect. While some researchers defend Japanese schooling as a model of equal educational opportunity (Cummings, 1980; White, 1987), others go so far as to suggest that the Japanese may be achieving their superior test performance in a climate that inhibits the development of those attitudes which educators in the United States place among the primary goals of democratic citizenship education (Duke, 1986; Rohlen, 1983; Wray, 1989).

The purpose of this study was to lay the groundwork for an investigation of the relationship between Japanese schooling and citizenship outcomes by developing valid and reliable instruments to measure both the political attitudes of Japanese middle school students and the climate in Japanese middle school classrooms. Compulsory schooling in Japan ends with the middle school years (grades 7-9), which have traditionally emphasized civics education. Because political socialization research has identified the years of middle childhood as an important period in the formation of basic political dispositions (Greenstein, 1965; Hess & Torney, 1967), an assessment of the civic attitudes of Japanese students is particularly relevant at the middle school level. Moreover, because social studies education research has demonstrated that classroom climate is a "potent correlate of student political attitudes" (Ehman, 1980a, p. 110), the study investigated student perceptions of classroom climate.

In order to develop psychometrically sound measures of the political attitudes and classroom climate in Japanese middle schools, items drawn from survey instruments previously employed in cross-national studies of civic education were field-tested with a sample of first- and third-year Japanese middle school students. The study addressed three main questions: (a) To what extent are scales used in previous research valid as measures of the political attitudes and classroom climate perceptions of the Japanese middle school students in the sample? (b) Do the patterns of variance in the response data indicate a factor structure on which underlying attitudinal dimensions can be scored? (c) To what extent are individual items valid and reliable measures of the attitude represented by the relevant scales?

Definitions

A democratic citizen, according to Parker and Jarolimek (1984), is "an informed person, skilled in the processes of a free society, who is committed to democratic values and is able, and feels obliged, to participate in social, political, and economic processes" (p. 6). Implied in this definition is a set of political attitudes and beliefs that support democratic values and incline the citizen to participate actively in the processes of a democratic society.

Democratic political attitudes that have been identified as measurable constructs in previous social studies education

research conducted in the United States and cross-nationally include: (a) political interest--general interest in political figures and events; (b) tolerance for dissent--support for the principle of free expression; (c) tolerance for diversity--belief in equal rights and freedoms for diverse groups of people; (d) social integration--belief that one belongs to the group; (e) political efficacy--belief that government officials and decisions are responsive to citizen actions and concerns; (f) political confidence--belief in one's personal ability to influence others who are engaged in decision-making; and (g) political trust--belief that people in government are trustworthy. There is a lack of consensus among researchers about the extent to which political trust is a desirable democratic attitude, some arguing that a certain degree of skepticism about political affairs may be a positive attribute of democratic citizens. Political cynicism is the term generally used to designate the inverse of political trust.

Classroom climate is defined as the socio-political atmosphere of the classroom, frequently measured in terms of the perceptions of the classroom participants--teachers, students and/or observers. Among these three, student perceptions are increasingly regarded by researchers as the most valid and reliable measure of the climate in a classroom (Ehman, 1970; Moos, 1979; Walberg, 1976). Furthermore, both theory and research on democratic classroom environments suggest that

classroom climate facilitates the development of democratic values and attitudes when students perceive their classrooms as places where they have opportunities to participate in open discussions, where they are encouraged to speak their opinions freely, where diverse points of view are respected, where all students are treated equally and fairly, and where there is a cohesive community to which they can belong (Angell, 1990).

Survey of the Literature

A survey of the research on political socialization provides considerable support for the importance of the middle school years in the development of the political self, and research on schooling factors that influence socio-political development suggests that classroom climate plays an important role. Cross-national studies of civic attitudes have provided further support for the relationship between classroom climate and civic outcomes, although few have considered Japanese schooling. A survey of the research that has investigated Japanese schooling revealed contradictory conclusions about the civic dispositions of Japanese students, suggesting the need for research which focuses on the citizenship outcomes of Japanese education.

Research on Political Socialization

Over the past two decades numerous studies have indicated that the years from about 7 until 13, roughly coinciding with middle childhood, constitute a critical period in the political socialization process--a period during which interest in the

political world is keen, and political concepts and political attitudes are being formed (Abraham, 1983; Connell, 1971; Greenstein, 1965; Hess & Torney, 1967; Moore, Lare & Wagner, 1985; Stevens, 1982). Patterns of tolerance for dissent seem to be well developed as early as fourth grade (Zellman & Sears, 1971). Feelings of political efficacy and/or political confidence appear to increase as students advance through the elementary grades (Easton & Dennis, 1968; Glenn, 1972; Hess & Torney, 1967), while initially high levels of political trust among first, second, and third graders appear to decline in the later elementary years, especially among students in lower socioeconomic groups (Glenn, 1972). This body of research literature reflects a limited international perspective, including studies of British (Stevens, 1982) and Australian students (Connell, 1971).

Two cross-national studies (Hahn, Tocci, & Angell, 1988; Torney, Oppenheim, & Farnen, 1975) that surveyed the civic attitudes of middle and high school students provide an indication of the political orientations of middle school students across nations. Based on analyses of data gathered from students in ten countries, Torney et al. (1975) found that the political attitudes of the average 14-year-old student generally fit one of two patterns: (a) high support for democratic values, low support for the national government, and low civic interest and participation; or the opposite, (b) low support for

democratic values, high support for the national government, high civic interest and participation.

Hahn et al. (1988), who surveyed students from late middle school (13-14 year olds) through the end of high school (18-19 year olds) in five western democracies, reported a lack of noteworthy attitudinal differences between age groups. These data lend further support to the argument that political attitudes are formed primarily in the years before age 14. Taken together, the findings of political socialization research indicate that the middle childhood years constitute a time when schooling might influence the development of political attitudes, values, and beliefs.

Research on Classroom Climate

Research in social studies education has identified classroom climate as one of the main schooling factors which influences the development of political attitudes in the United States (Ehman, 1980a). Four aspects of classroom climate have been empirically associated with civic outcomes: (a) teacher characteristics; (b) intellectual openness; (c) participation; and (d) cooperative learning.

Findings of research on teacher characteristics that influence political attitudes suggest that teacher behaviors which occur in class discussions have powerful effects on classroom climate. When teachers model interest in student ideas by approving of and providing for class discussions, students

express more interest in the ideas of their peers (Hawley, 1977; Rossell & Hawley, 1981). When teachers ask divergent questions and create an open discussion climate, students share their ideas and opinions more freely (Torney-Purta & Lansdale, 1986). Lastly, when teachers show tolerance for diverse interests and opinions and provide frequent opportunities for peer interaction, student tolerance increases (Allman-Snyder, May, & Garcia, 1975; Hawley & Eyler, 1983).

Ehman (1980a) asserted that "When students have an opportunity to engage freely in making suggestions for structuring the classroom environment, and when they have opportunities to discuss all sides of controversial topics, the classroom climate is deemed 'open'" (p. 108). Implied in this definition is that open discussion is a critical aspect of an open or democratic classroom climate; and, furthermore, that an open discussion is one characterized by free expression and exchange of different points of view on controversial issues--both those that arise in the classroom and those that reflect the concerns of society at large. Research in social studies education has provided substantial evidence that classrooms characterized by intellectual openness are associated with more democratic political attitudes (Ehman, 1980a; Ehman, 1980b; Glenn, 1972; Grossman, 1975; Hahn, Tocci, & Angell, 1988; Torney, Oppenheim, & Farnen, 1975; Zevin, 1983).

The benefits of student participation in self-governance have been well documented in Just Community experiments (Lickona, 1977; Murphy, 1988; Power, 1981); but other studies indicate that participation in goal-setting and rule-making also helps to create a democratic classroom climate in more traditional classroom settings (Dillon & Grout, 1976). Finally, the research of Johnson and Johnson and colleagues has demonstrated a relationship between cooperative learning strategies and classroom climate that contributes to feelings of community and social integration (Johnson, Johnson, & Anderson, 1983; Johnson, Johnson, Johnson, & Anderson, 1976; Zahn, Kagan, & Widaman, 1986).

Cross-national Studies of Civic Attitudes

Of particular relevance here are the ten-nation study of civic education conducted by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) (Torney et al., 1975) and the five-nation survey of political attitudes conducted by Hahn et al. (1988). In the IEA study, questionnaires administered to more than 30,000 students in three age groups--10-year olds, 14-year olds and pre-university students--solicited demographic information related to home background and perceptions of school experience, and measured four areas of civic outcomes: a) knowledge of civic education, b) support for democratic values, c) support for the national government, and d) civic interest/participation. Results of the study indicated

that classroom climate variables were the only school-based variables that contributed positively to all of the desired outcomes: "More knowledgeable, less authoritarian, and more interested students came from schools where [students] were encouraged to have free discussion and to express their opinion in class" (Torney et al., 1975, p. 18).

Hahn et al. (1988) used the Civic Attitudes Questionnaire to measure the political attitudes and climate perceptions of 1,459 secondary students in five western democracies. Analysis of item frequencies indicated that most students in all five countries perceived their classes as possessing characteristics of an open climate, and agreed that their teachers encouraged free expression. Moreover, there were low, but significant, correlations of climate perceptions with all other scales. Hahn suggested that further work is needed to develop instruments that measure the constructs of classroom climate and support for free expression. Although the IEA and Hahn et al. research pioneered in comparisons of civic education across numerous modern, industrialized democracies, both studies conspicuously neglect to address civic education in Japan.

Research on Civic Education in Japan

Historically, the middle school in Japan has been associated with civics education. Prior to World War II, most students attended a non-compulsory, two-year extension of the elementary school, which offered courses "to train children for life in

their home community. . .[in which] specially trained teachers gave both a vocational and a moral civics emphasis" (Singleton, 1967). A small number of boys and girls took postelementary examinations to gain entrance into academic or vocational education tracks, which were promising channels for upward social mobility. After the war, the term "middle school" was carried over from these highly competitive postelementary schools and applied to the three-year compulsory middle schools, which were modeled after American junior high schools.

In addition to providing universal access to postelementary education, the postwar middle school program designed by American occupation advisors included a social studies component. Civic education was introduced as the standard social studies course for third year middle school students and continues to be taught to all ninth graders in contemporary Japanese middle schools. Coinciding with the three terms of the school year, the civic education course is organized into three units: the Japanese constitution, the structure and function of government (including the "political participations [sic] of the citizen"), and the national economy (Facts, 1984).

In a recent study of social studies education in Japan, Berman (1990) observed that confusion about the role of social studies has persisted among Japanese teachers from the time it was introduced into the curriculum. National curriculum revisions made periodically since the postwar reform that

instituted social studies have been consistently in the direction of increased segmentation of social studies into its constituent parts (Nagai, 1979, quoted in Berman, 1990). In the mid-sixties, moral education was designated by the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture as a separate subject area. Taught by the homeroom teacher one period each week in the middle school, the moral education program is ostensibly a forum for discussions of personal dilemmas and school problems. However, some observers have reported that teachers, accustomed to lecturing from the teacher's manual, are "rather inept at leading group discussions of 'real life' issues" (Rohlen, 1983, p. 180); and that students, accustomed only to listening and dutifully copying the outlines that teachers write on the blackboard, "seem to be unwilling to ask questions or discuss various points, despite overt encouragement from the teacher" (Singleton, 1967).

Rohlen (1983) has pointed out, in his recent ethnographic study of Japanese high schools, that citizenship in Japanese prewar education meant demonstrating loyalty and carrying out the moral duties of a "subject." According to Rohlen, the efforts of the American postwar reformers to redirect Japanese educational goals towards educating citizens rather than subjects "never captured the popular imagination" (p. 74). He found that contemporary teachers generally accept citizenship as a desirable goal of education, but feel it is their duty to teach citizenship through "firm guidance and control" (p. 239). Based on extensive

participant observation at five very different high schools in the Kobe area, Rohlen concluded that, in the Japanese high school, there was no encouragement for individualism, that ideological indoctrination was rarely encountered, and that, as a result, Japanese students are "even more politically apathetic than their American counterparts" (p. 210).

Van Wolferen (1989), a Dutch journalist and 25-year resident of Japan who recently authored a comprehensive analysis of the Japanese political-industrial system, The Enigma of Japanese Power, contended that these same attitudes characterize modern Japanese adults, who have been trained in school to be workers at predetermined levels within the system's hierarchy rather than educated as citizens. Furthermore, he observed that their lack of civic involvement was well-founded: "Japanese citizens do not in practice have recourse to the law; in fact, the idea of 'citizen' as distinct from 'subject' is hardly understood" (p. 22).

In a recent comparison of Japanese and United States education, Wray (1989) commended the "narrow and rigorous" Japanese curriculum for producing disciplined and competent high school graduates, but suggested that this was being achieved at the expense of citizenship goals: "The [Japanese] curriculum is designed to deal with the long-range interests of the economy and the nation. This narrow focus carries the disadvantages of

neglecting differences and abilities and the long-range goal of a more democratic society" (p. 14).

At the same time, Kurisaka (1989) speculated that "Japanese politics are about to undergo drastic change" as a result of the recent Recruit scandal and the subsequent defeat of the Liberal Democratic Party in the 1989 Upper House elections. (p. 1). Furthermore, he noted that "under such circumstances, the nation's interest in politics is growing" and that "the Japanese people strongly desire steady progress toward a democracy. . ." (p. 2).

Citizenship education is, in fact, one of the three primary goals of the Japanese middle school. Ministry of Education guidelines state that the aim is "to develop basic civic qualities essential to the builders of a democratic and peaceful nation and society" (Ministry of Education, 1983). As defined earlier, the civic qualities that have been associated with democratic citizenship in previous research include: political interest, political confidence, political efficacy, tolerance for dissent, tolerance for diversity, a sense of social integration, and a concept of a citizen as an active participant in the polity. This pilot study was conducted for the purpose of developing psychometrically sound instruments to measure the extent to which these civic qualities are present among Japanese middle school students.

Methodology

A questionnaire composed of 88 items that were translated into Japanese was field-tested in one first and one third year class at each of two Japanese middle schools during the first week of December, 1989. Statistical analyses of the response data were conducted using SYSTAT (Wilkinson, 1988). Decisions regarding the validity of the items as measures of the political attitudes of the Japanese middle school students in the sample were based on statistical and logical analyses of the response data. Results of this analysis raised questions that were addressed in formal interviews with Japanese teachers and informal discussions with Japanese students, English-speaking foreigners working in Japanese schools, and a Japanese school board official who served as the administrative advisor to the project. Finally, observations of social studies and moral education classes in five Japanese middle schools provided further insight into the findings.

Sample

The total sample of 143 students was composed almost equally of first- and third-year students who were enrolled at two Japanese public middle schools located in and near Kanazawa, a city of 430,000 on the northwest coast of Honshu. As is typical of Japanese urban centers, the Kanazawa metropolitan area contains both cosmopolitan urban as well as truly rural populations. Avoiding the extremes of the tiny, remote

elementary school-attached middle schools, the small, sectarian middle schools, and the university-attached preparatory academies, the sample was drawn equally from a school in a densely populated business/residential district of Kanazawa and a school in a nearby agricultural area.

Most Japanese students attend the middle school in their own neighborhoods which, throughout Japanese cities, are usually populated by families of varying socio-economic status. Responses to questions about parents' education and occupations indicated that the students in the sample did represent a cross-section of socio-economic classes. It was also assumed that the sample represented a cross-section of intellectual abilities because grouping students by ability does not appear to be common in the middle schools. Three of the participating teachers said that the students in the classes in which the questionnaire was administered were average; one indicated that the first year class had more than an average number of slower students in it. There were approximately 68 males and 72 females in the sample population (three of the student respondents did not indicate their sex).

The questionnaire was administered by four Japanese teachers of English who selected one of their regular classes for the pilot test. Due to the difficulty, in Japan, of gaining bureaucratic sanction for access to students without imposing unwanted responsibility on arbitrarily chosen and potentially

unwilling teachers (a factor which might influence student responses), classrooms were not sampled at random, but in accordance with teachers' willingness to participate in the study. Moreover, participants were sought only among teachers of English in order to facilitate communications with the researcher.

Meetings were held with the cooperating teachers several days prior to the administration of the questionnaire in order to give a brief explanation of the research, to allow the teachers to review the questionnaire, and to discuss the administration procedure. The researcher was not present in the classes when the questionnaires were administered in order to avoid the possibility of biasing the responses of students who might have made an effort to give answers that would please the visitor.

Instruments

The survey instrument included items on ten scales, eight of which had been used across cultures in previous research as measures of political orientations and climate perceptions: (a) political trust, (b) political efficacy, (c) political confidence, (d) political interest, (e) support for freedom of expression, (f) expected future participation, (g) concept of the good citizen, and (h) classroom climate perception (Hahn et al., 1988; Torney et al., 1975). In addition, a set of items taken from three different instruments was tested as a scale measuring feelings of social integration (Ehman, 1969; Moos, 1979; Zahn,

Kagan, & Widaman, 1986), and a new set of items was field tested on a scale hypothesized to measure perceived freedom from censure. Shown in Appendix A is the complete survey instrument with items organized according to the hypothesized scales. On the actual questionnaire, items on all scales except the good citizen and future participation scales were presented in random order.

All of the items on the scales of political trust, political efficacy, political confidence, and political interest were used in studies of United States' students by Harwood (1989) and Blankenship (1989). They reported, respectively, alpha coefficients of .74 and .70 for the political trust scale, .78 and .73 for the political efficacy scale, .88 and .83 for the political confidence scale, and .87 and .85 for the political interest scale.[1] Some of the items on the proposed classroom climate scale were used on the IEA survey of civic attitudes conducted by Torney et al. (1975); other items adapted from classroom climate scales used by Harwood (1989) and Hahn et al. (1988) were revised to address the climate of Japanese middle school classes in general rather than the climate of social studies classes specifically.

Items on the social integration scale were selected from the Social Relations Scale developed by Zahn, Kagan, and Widaman (1986), the Affiliation Scale developed by Moos (1979) as part of the Classroom Environment Scale, and Ehman's (1969) Social

Integration Scale. The hypothesized freedom of expression scale included items from a similar scale used by Hahn et al. (1988) and selected items from the IEA survey (Torney et al., 1975).

Items on the scale designed to measure students' perceptions of censure were developed as a result of classroom observations made in Japanese middle schools which suggested a curious paradox. Although teachers asked questions and often exhorted students to respond or express opinions, the students appeared highly reluctant to speak. Only when a teacher called upon a specific individual to stand and speak was a response given; and then, if the teacher was unusually insistent, the student would self-consciously mumble a very brief answer. The censure scale represented an effort to explore the possibility that an underlying attitude--fear of censure--works in subtle opposition to the teacher's professed allegiance to free expression in Japanese middle schools.

Response options to all of the items (except for those on the good citizen and participation scales) were recorded on a six-point Likert scale as follows: (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) slightly agree, (4) slightly disagree, (5) disagree, and (6) strongly disagree. Therefore, lower scores represented more positive attitudes. As the ability to maintain a neutral posture is regarded as strength of character in Japanese society, a neutral or "undecided" response option was omitted in order to avoid tempting students with what might appear to be the most

prudent response. However, responding to IEA researchers Oppenheim and Torney (1974) who cautioned against artificial measurements of adult categories not yet formulated as attitudes in the student, the cooperating teachers were instructed to tell the students that it was permissible to skip questions which they did not understand. An analysis of the missing data was, therefore, expected to provide information regarding both the comprehensibility of the items and their appropriateness for the students in the sample population.

The questionnaire included two parts which presented the scaled items as clusters on the instrument: the good citizen scale (Part I) and the participation scale (Part III). The good citizenship scale listed eighteen behaviors (votes, belongs to a political party, respects family, etc.) which students were asked to classify as: (1) what a good citizen does, (2) has no relationship to good citizenship, (3) what a bad citizen does, or (4) I don't know. A similar good citizenship scale was field-tested by IEA researchers in 1970 with a sample of 1300 students in seven countries (Oppenheim & Torney, 1974). In that study, a factor analysis of the scale responses produced three main factors: (a) "active good citizenship," which included such citizen activities as joining a political party and getting others to vote; (b) "disengaged good citizenship," perceptions of the good citizen as one who obeys laws and pays taxes; and (c)

"non-political good citizenship" which was defined by item choices such as hard work and good manners.

Although the IEA citizenship scale descriptors were based on an analysis of extensive interviews with children in ten countries, it seemed possible that descriptors appropriate to the Japanese student's concept of a good citizen might be missing from the list. In an effort to identify categories of meaning which might be unique to Japanese students, two open-ended questions were posed in this section, one which asked students to give an example of something that a good citizen would do, and another, an example of something that a good citizen would not do. Responses to these two questions were not included in the factor analysis of the good citizen scale, but the frequencies were tallied and new categories analyzed for their usefulness as additions to a revised good citizen scale.

The participation scale, adapted from Harwood (1989), also presented a list of potential citizenship behaviors, asking students to indicate the extent to which they expected to participate politically in various ways as adult citizens. The response options on a four-point scale were: (1) I definitely will, (2) I might, (3) I probably won't, and (4) I definitely won't. Again, a lower score indicated a more positive attitude--here, a stronger expectation of future participation.

The questionnaire concluded with an optional section that solicited demographic information: academic score averages, high

school plans, level of parents' education, and parents' occupations. The latter question asked students to write in both their mother's and father's occupations so that appropriate categories could be deduced for use in further studies.

The survey instrument was translated into Japanese by a bilingual Japanese woman who teaches Japanese to foreigners at the Kanazawa Social Education Center. The translation of items designed to measure attitudes and perceptions is a special problem because they are "notoriously sensitive (especially where children are concerned) to slight fluctuations of meaning" (Oppenheim & Torney, 1974, p. 161). In order to minimize the loss of content validity in the translation process, the researcher met repeatedly with the translator to clarify the concepts in the items and to develop a common vocabulary of political and social terminology. The translator also used the Japanese text for the third year civics course as a reference for political terms that would be appropriate to the language of middle school students.

When the first draft of the translation was completed, a bilingual native speaker of English back-translated the instrument into English. Following procedures recommended by Frey (1976), a critical comparison of the two forms was then made in the original language. Further revisions of many items were made on the basis of this review in order to more closely produce equivalent forms. Items which underwent major revisions were

once more back-translated and reviewed. Throughout this process a record was kept of translation difficulties, including notation of resolved and unresolved discrepancies in meaning. Finally, to further test the content validity of the translated items for middle school students, a middle school teacher was consulted on points of item comprehensibility and language appropriateness. Final back translations of all the attitudinal statements appear at the end of each item listed on the scales in Appendix A.

The final reviewer of the translated items was the school board official who acted as an advisor to the project. As Teacher Consultant for English teachers in Kanazawa's middle schools, his approval of the questionnaire items was necessary in order to secure permission for the English teachers to administer the survey in their classes. Generally supportive of the research effort, the advisor nonetheless made several major changes in the composition of the questionnaire. For example, upon reading the classroom climate item "when we have discussions in class, we are encouraged to consider different points of view," he insisted that discussions should be qualified with the phrase "of school life" because that was the only context in which discussions occurred at school and that students would be otherwise confused by the question. This revision limited the relevance of the item to the classroom climate scale; at the same time, however, it was the first indication that classroom climate

items related to class discussions might not be valid measures of the students' school experience.

Shown in Appendix B is a tolerance for diversity scale. Originally developed for the IEA survey to measure students' support for the principle of equal rights applied to diverse groups, the tolerance for diversity scale was eliminated from the instrument because of the advisor's strong negative reaction to several items on the scale. It asks students to decide whether particular minority groups should have "more," "the same," or "fewer" rights than other groups. When adapted for Japanese students, the proposed list of minority groups included Communists, Koreans, and Burakumin--all three frequently mentioned as discriminated groups in commentaries on Japanese society. The naming of these three groups, however, was alarming to the advisor and the colleagues with whom he conferred at the Board of Education office.

Emphasizing the inevitable trouble which would ensue from raising the issue of discrimination against Burakumin with students, the advisor explained:

> Actually it's true in daily life in Japan. It is a big problem in Kansai and some other areas--around Osaka, etc. The teachers in Kansai would especially be angry at such a question. Here in Kanazawa, they would be very, very nervous about it. Teachers do not want students to answer questions like this because all

people in the world should be equal. They think it is better not to talk about it. From now on we are studying about it [discrimination against the Burakumin]. Especially in the Kansai area they are studying about it very much, but teachers would not want students to know about it.

Equally strong reactions to the use of Communists and Koreans made it clear that the scale could create problems which would jeopardize the entire project. Therefore, the tolerance for diversity scale was dropped from the pilot measures.

Prior to classroom field testing, two students were asked to complete the survey instrument in an informal setting in order to detect points of confusion, misunderstanding, or problems related to the questionnaire format. A few changes in written directions and the methods for administering the questionnaire were made as a result of that trial.

Considerable care was taken to insure the participating teachers' cooperation and to optimize the possibility of eliciting candid responses from the students. Meetings with each of the teachers were held before the administration of the questionnaire for the purpose of explaining the idea of "confidentiality" and the general instructions to be given to students about the questionnaire. Appendix C contains the directions for administering the questionnaire which were presented to the participating teachers during that meeting. The

researcher assumed that teachers understood the relevance of both confidentiality and candor to the validity of the responses, and that they were able to convey these ideas to the students who, in turn, responded honestly. Appendix D shows the translated questionnaire as it was presented to the Japanese students.

Analysis

Item, factor, and logical analyses of the response data were conducted to evaluate the validity of the items as measures of the political attitudes of Japanese middle school students and to estimate the reliability of those measures. All statistical procedures were performed using SYSTAT (Wilkinson, 1988).

In order to estimate the reliabilities of the a priori scales, initial item analyses were performed on the 54 attitude statements grouped by subscales of political interest, free expression, political trust, political efficacy, political confidence, classroom climate, and freedom from censure. Then, a factor analysis was performed to assess the extent to which the structural components of these data resembled the a priori scales. Items which clustered together on factors to suggest the same underlying attitudinal dimensions represented by the a priori scales provided construct-related evidence of the validity of the scales as measures of the Japanese students' political attitudes.

The factor analysis provided a means of reducing the data and constituting factor-based scales. Although attitude

statements are seldom unidimensional, factor analysis is useful in identifying items in which one dimension dominates. Items which cluster together, or load on a factor, define the attitudinal dimension which the factor represents (Oppenheim & Torney, 1974). In addition, the proportion of variance attributable to the underlying attitudinal dimension represented by the relevant factor was estimated in the analysis.

Based on a logical analysis of items which had high loadings on a factor, factor-based scales were constructed. Item analyses of these factor-based scales were conducted to estimate the reliability of the newly constituted scales and to further refine them. On the factor-based scales for which reliability estimates were judged adequate to support further analysis, composite scores for each student were computed by summing and averaging their scores on the scale items. Group contrasts of scale scores by grade, school, and sex were made for the purpose of providing further evidence of the validity of the factor-based scales as measures of the political attitudes of the Japanese middle school students in the sample. Finally, a logical analysis of the attitudinal statement items that were not retained on one of the factor-based scales was undertaken.

Factor analysis, item analysis, and logical analysis were also used to assess the psychometric soundness of the good citizen scale. The factor analysis of the responses on the good citizen scale was an exploratory analysis to identify possible

dimensionality in the students' concept of a good citizen. Items that loaded high on a factor and appeared to be meaningfully related constituted factor-based scales, which were analyzed to estimate reliability. A comparison of the factor-based scales with factor structures identified in previous research provided construct-related evidence of the validity of the scales as measures of the Japanese middle school students' attitudes towards citizenship. To provide further evidence of the experimental validity of the scale that appeared to have adequate reliability, group contrasts were made of the composite scores calculated on that scale.

An item analysis of the eight items on the expected future participation scale was conducted separately to estimate the scale reliability, and scale scores were subsequently calculated. Using the scale scores, group contrasts were performed by grade, school, and sex to further test the experimental validity of the participation scale as a measure of the Japanese students' attitudes towards political participation.

Results

Analysis of Attitude Statements

Results of the item analyses of the 54 attitudinal statements on eight a priori scales are shown in Table 1. For each scale two reliability estimates are shown: the alpha coefficient and the Spearman-Brown prophesy formula.

Listed in rank order from the scale with the highest reliability coefficients, the political interest scale had the highest reliability estimates on both the alpha coefficient (.79) and the Spearman-Brown (.84). Almost as high were the reliability estimates for the free expression scale (alpha = .79 and Spearman-Brown = .76); and only slightly less strong were the reliability estimates for the political trust scale (alpha = .71 and Spearman-Brown = .75). Based on comparisons of the two reliability estimates for each of the three scales, all appeared to be relatively stable scales and viable measures of political attitudes among the students in the sample. Moreover, the analysis indicated that alpha for the free expression scale could be improved to .81 if one item were eliminated from the scale: "Newspapers and magazines should be allowed to print anything they want." It also indicated that alpha for the political interest scale could be improved to .79 by eliminating the item which read "I think I would enjoy being involved in making decisions which affect my community."

The low reliability estimates that were obtained for the remaining five scales suggested the possibility of random response variability, translation problems, or other measurement errors. The number of students who responded to all scale items dropped below 100 on three of the five scales--political efficacy (n = 82), classroom climate (n = 94), and freedom from censure (n = 98). These low response rates further indicated that the items

on the scales might have contained concepts which were unfamiliar to the students or that comprehension obstacles related to the translation were present in the items.

The varimax rotated factor structure of the 54 attitudinal statement items is shown in Appendix E. Due to the large number of cases with missing responses on one or more items, only 60 cases were included in the analysis. Six factors were extracted which together accounted for 47.8% of the total common variance in the response data.

Loading highest on the first factor, which explained 11% of the total variance, were six free expression scale items with loadings ranging from .794 to .651. Items from three other scales also appeared on this factor, albeit with slightly weaker loadings: (a) an item from the political efficacy scale which says that political matters should not be left to political experts (.563); (b) a political confidence scale item which (when reversed for scoring) says that "When I grow up, my vote will matter" (.563); and (c) a classroom climate scale item which says (when reversed for scoring) that teachers aren't too busy to help weaker students (.551). It seemed reasonable to accept both the political efficacy and political confidence items as meaningful items in this cluster because both imply the important function of free expression on the part of ordinary citizens in relationship to government affairs. With the exception of the classroom climate item, then, the items which loaded on the first

factor together indicated an underlying attitude toward the principle of free expression among the Japanese students in the sample. The only item from the a priori free expression scale that did not load on this factor was the item that also appeared to detract from the reliability estimates in the prior item analysis.

The identity of the second factor, which accounted for 10% of the total variance, was established by four items from the political trust scale which appeared on the factor with strong loadings of .785, .674, .625, and .596, and a fifth with a weaker loading of .447. Two a priori political trust scale items did not appear to load on the factor. However, three items from the classroom climate scale and two items from the political efficacy scale had loadings on this factor greater than .500. In addition, a freedom from censure scale item showed a moderate loading on the factor (.472) and seemed to have a meaningful relationship with the other items. Although these eleven items addressed fairly disparate propositions, from the honesty of legislators to teacher behaviors in class discussions, a close inspection of the items indicated a common dimension. At issue seemed to be the idea of trust--not only political trust, but rather an attitude towards the trustworthiness of adult behavior in general. An examination of the means on the eleven items--all of which exceeded the median score--indicated that the underlying dimension represented a lack of trust. Therefore, borrowing from

prior political socialization research which has referred to the inverse of political trust as political cynicism and broadening it to include cynicism towards other adults in authority, the second factor was labeled "cynicism towards authority."

Supporting the validity of the a priori political interest scale as a measure of the political interest construct, five of the scale items appeared on the third factor with high loadings that ranged from .765 to .628. Only one political interest item, the same item which detracted from the reliability estimates in the item analysis, did not appear to load on this third factor, which accounted for 7% of the total variance in the data. Two political efficacy items which had loadings of .592 and .507 on the factor did not appear to have a meaningful relationship to the political interest items and were therefore excluded from the factor-based scale in further analyses.

Items which appeared on the fourth factor with moderate to weak loadings were associated with four different a priori scales--freedom from censure, social integration, political efficacy, and political trust. Although four of the freedom from censure scale items appeared on this factor, two had negative loadings which further clouded the nature of the factor. When scoring on the negative loadings was reversed in the subsequent item analysis, however, a moderate intercorrelation among four of the items suggested that the underlying dimension of this factor may have been related to fear of censure.

The fifth factor was also composed of items from three different scales, although the five items had higher loadings, from .670 to .502. An examination of the frequencies and means of items loading on the fifth factor revealed a pattern of extreme responses--some in a positive and some in a negative direction, which accounted for the mixed signs on the loadings. The item which loaded highest on this factor was a classroom climate scale item which stated: "In my classes we have discussions about political, economic and social issues." The mean response on this item was the highest (5.16) of all the item means, representing a strong negative response and a high level of agreement that discussions are positively rare in Japanese middle school classrooms. The item with the second highest loading, from the social integration scale, (when reversed for scoring) said: "It doesn't take long to get to know everyone's name in this class." The mean response on this item was one of the lowest (2.20), with a high percentage of students indicating that learning the names of their 35 or more classmates had been quite easy. The other items which loaded on this factor had similarly extreme means. Taken together they suggested a category of questions with perfectly obvious answers from the students' point of view. It appeared that the underlying attitudinal dimension was one of mild indignation at being asked such foolish questions. Therefore, the fifth factor was called "foolish questions."

Appearing together on the sixth factor with strong loadings of .799 and .656 were two items from the social integration scale. Also loading high (.629) on the sixth factor was an item from the political confidence scale which asked students if they felt that they could decide things in groups, a question with a clear social dimension. The sixth factor, then, suggested an underlying perception of the social dynamic in the classroom. However, six of the eight items on the hypothesized social integration scale failed to load on this factor.

Appendix F lists the items which were retained from each factor to constitute factor-based scales. In summary, items on four of the hypothesized scales--free expression, political trust, political interest, and freedom from censure--appeared as clusters on a single factor, providing some confirmation of the validity of those a priori scales as measures of Japanese middle school students' political attitudes. The six-factor structure which resulted from the factor analysis provided no support for the hypothesized scales of political efficacy, political confidence, or classroom climate. Items from each of these scales loaded on several factors, but none clustered together to effectively contribute to the definition of a single factor. Twelve of the survey items were not associated (with a loading at .400 or above) with any of the six factors.

Based on the logical analysis of items which loaded together on the six factors, new scales were constituted and an item

analysis was performed to estimate the reliability of the factor-based scales. The item analysis of each scale was performed on all cases for which there were no missing data on scale items. Table 2 reports both the alpha and Spearman-Brown reliability estimates obtained in the analysis. Reliability estimates obtained for the first three scales--.84 and .88 for the free expression scale; .81 and .86 for the cynicism towards authority scale; and .83 and .80 for the political interest scale--were adequate for the purpose of further analyses of the scales. Although the weaker reliability estimates obtained for the freedom from censure and social integration scales were not adequate to support further analyses, they did suggest the possibility of additional attitudinal dimensions that might be measured with improved items. The foolish questions scale also appeared to lack reliability; however, the nature of the factor suggested a logical analysis of the items that clustered on this factor.

Taken together, the results of the factor and item analyses indicated that the free expression, cynicism towards authority, and political interest factor-based scales were valid and reliable measures of political attitude constructs in the sample population. Therefore, composite scores on those three scales were calculated and comparisons of the scaled scores were performed between groups by grade, school type, and sex. Tables 3, 4, and 5 report the results of independent samples t-tests

conducted between those groups on each of the three scales. The comparisons were tested for statistical significance at a probability level of .05.

Results of the t-tests indicated that there were two statistically significant differences among the comparisons made. On the free expression scale, the third year students expressed a higher level of support for the principle of free expression (M = 2.17) than the first year students (M = 2.67), $t(138) = 3.83$, $p < .01$. On the political interest scale, the third year students indicated a stronger level of interest in political affairs (M = 3.14) than the first year students (M = 3.64), $t(139) = 2.67$, $p < .01$. There were no significant differences attributable to school type or sex between the sample scores on the factor-based scales.

An analysis of items which did not load at .500 or above on one of the three factor-based scales is presented in Appendix G. Listed also in that appendix are the percentages of missing data for each item, statistics which suggested comprehension and translation problems in the weaker items.

Analysis of the Good Citizen Scale

Results of the factor analysis of the 18 items on the good citizen scale and the percentage of the total variance explained by the rotated factors are shown in Appendix H. Six factors, which together accounted for 58% of the total variance in the data, were extracted using the varimax rotation. Based on a

logical analysis of items that clustered together on the six factors, factor-based scales were constituted. Item analyses were then performed on the factor-based scales to determine the extent to which those items were measuring a common underlying attitudinal dimension towards citizenship. Table 6 shows the alpha and Spearman-Brown reliability estimates for the six factor-based scales. In order to determine the nature of the attitudinal dimension indicated by the scales, scale means as well as item response frequencies and means were examined.

The six items that clustered on the first factor with high loadings from .746 to .519 were all behaviors related to active or participatory citizenship. In order from the highest loadings, they were: (a) belongs to a political party, (b) knows what taxes are spent for, (c) encourages others to vote, (d) belongs to a labor union, (e) tries to participate in politics, and (f) votes. Reliability estimates of .73 (alpha) and .73 (Spearman-Brown) for the active citizen scale composed of these items were adequate for comparisons by groups on the scale. Shown in Table 7 are three t-test comparisons performed on the active citizen scale by grade, school, and sex. Again, there was a statistically significant difference between first and third year students. The third year students expressed a higher degree of support for the concept of active citizenship ($\underline{M}$ = 2.02) than the first year students ($\underline{M}$ = 2.44), $\underline{t}(140) = 3.90$, $\underline{p} < .01$.

There were no significant differences on the active citizenship scale between groups by school type or sex.

The two items which appeared on the second factor with high loadings--respect for one's family and doing things to the best of one's ability--suggested a non-political concept of the good citizen. An alpha reliability estimates of .48 for the two items was not high enough to warrant further analyses of a scale based on this factor. However, these two items received the highest level of support from students as behaviors characteristic of a good citizen, with 84% responding that respecting one's family was characteristic of a good citizen and 73% that doing things to the best of one's ability was a good citizenship behavior. Analysis of the responses to the open-ended question that asked students to give an example of a good citizenship behavior supported the strength of the attitude in the sample population that citizenship is non-political. Most frequently mentioned were: (a) being kind and gentle, (b) doing helpful things for others, and (c) thinking of others. These suggest possible items which, if added to the list, might improve the strength of the non-political citizenship scale. When asked for their own categories of things a good citizen would not do, students mentioned repeatedly: (a) criminal acts such as murder and stealing, (b) selfishness, and (c) racism.

Analysis of the Participation Scale

An item analysis of the eight expected future participation scale items, which were included together in Part III of the instrument, yielded reliability estimates of .71 (alpha) and .87 (Spearman-Brown). Scores on the eight items were summed and averaged to create an index of students' attitude towards political participation as adults. With a four-point response scale on the items from "I probably will" to "I definitely won't, the group mean score for all eight items (M = 2.87, SD = = 0.46) suggested a low level of expected future participation among the students in the sample. However, an independent sample t-test comparison of the participation scale scores by sex indicated that males had significantly higher expectations of participating in politics (M = 2.78) than females (M = 2.95), $t(131) = 2.10$, $p < .04$. There did not appear to be significant differences between grade or school groups. Table 8 reports the results of the t-tests comparisons on the participation scale.

Discussion

The non-randomness of the sample, the small number of cases used in the factor analyses, and the pattern of missing data limit the generalizability of the findings of this study. Therefore, the sample cannot be construed as necessarily representative of the general population of Japanese middle school students, nor even of the students in the particular schools.

Results of the analysis, however, support the construct validity of five scales--free expression, cynicism towards authority, political interest, active citizenship, and expected political participation--as measures of political attitudes among the Japanese middle school students who responded to the questionnaire. Moreover, the attitude profile suggested by the students' responses on the five scales is similar to one identified in previous cross-national research, providing further construct-related evidence of the scales' validity. The Japanese students indicated strong support for the principle of free expression, moderately high cynicism towards authority, and low levels of political interest and expected participation. This particular combination of civic attitudes closely resembles one of two profiles of 14 year olds' civic attitudes--high support for democratic values, low support for the national government, and low civic interest and participation--reported by the IEA study of civics attitudes in ten nations. The categories of good citizenship that were suggested in this analysis--active and non-political citizenship--were also identified in the IEA research.

The experimental validity of the scales as measures of the civic attitudes of these Japanese students was supported by the results of the group contrasts. Given the well-documented homogeneity of the Japanese population and the constraints of a national curriculum, the apparent lack of significant differences between the political attitudes of students in different schools

was predictable. The one apparent difference in the political attitudes of males and females was the degree to which they expected to participate in politics as adults, with males anticipating more political involvement than females. This is also a reasonable outcome, based on the long-standing exclusion of Japanese women from politics, a tradition which is only recently showing some signs of change.

In a society characterized by hierarchical relationships based on age in every arena of social activity, the most logical place where differences might be expected is between age cohorts. Results of this study indicated differences between the first and third year students on measures of support for free expression, political interest, and support for active citizenship. In each case, the third year students expressed more positive political attitudes. The differences between the two groups might be explained by increased cognitive ability of the older students, by more exposure to the media, by their academic experiences such as civics class, or any number of other factors.

There did not appear to be a difference between the first and third year students on the scale of cynicism towards authority. Regardless of grade, school, or sex, the Japanese students in this study expressed a moderately high level of cynicism towards politicians and others in authority. A widespread lack of trust in politicians might well be expected in light of the many Japanese public officials who were publicly

disgraced over the prior 24 months. Taken together, the logical similarities and differences found here between students grouped by grade, school, and sex provide considerable support for the validity of the free expression, cynicism towards authority, political interest, active citizen, and participation scales as measures of the political attitudes of these Japanese students.

Although the social integration and fear of censure scales appeared to lack adequate reliability, there was some evidence to support the presence of the expected underlying attitudinal dimensions towards group affiliation and censure among the students. A content analysis of the a priori social integration scale items that did not load on the social integration factor suggested the possibility that students were confused by negatively stated items or by the translation of some terms. It also seemed plausible that the concept of social integration, being central to the Japanese social order, may be expressed in ways unique to Japanese thinking or that belonging to one's group is so taken for granted by students as to render thinking about it difficult.

Four of the six items on the a priori freedom from censure scale loaded together on the fourth factor, albeit with mixed signs and three rather weakly. A content analysis of the items suggested confusion of meaning due to multiple dimensions in a single item and the use of causal phrases. For example, the statement "often people don't say what they really think because

they don't want to lose friends" required students to assess how people behave, what they feel, and why--a mixture of behavioral, affective, and social dimensions that probably presented an obstacle to students' understanding of the question. Most of the items on the freedom from censure scale could be improved by creating two items with more distinctly unitary dimensions; the elimination of the causal phrases would also improve the clarity of the items.

There was no evidence to support the hypothesized classroom climate scale as a valid measure of the students' perceptions of the socio-political realities of their classroom environment. The Japanese school board member who acted as an advisor to the researcher strongly counseled against the use of statements that referred to class discussions, maintaining that it was pointless because there were none. His skepticism was confirmed by 80% of the students, who disagreed with the proposition that there were class discussions about social, economic, and political issues; 20% of the students in the sample did not even venture a random response to the item that asked about class discussions of student life. Clearly there were no discussions in the classroom experience of these Japanese middle school students, in spite of the fact that Japanese teachers often expressed--both to the researcher and to their students--the desire for more open communication and active participation on the part of the students. Classroom climate scale items that referred to teacher

behaviors during discussions and to attitudes towards student opinions during discussions appeared on the foolish questions and cynicism scales. The contradiction between what teachers said about open communication and the lecturing mode that consistently characterized their teaching may have contributed to student cynicism, confusion, or uncertainty about the social and political realities of their classroom environments.

Similarly lacking in the analysis of these data was evidence to support political efficacy and political confidence as measurable constructs. Items from the political efficacy scale had scattered loadings on four different factors, and items from the political confidence scale loaded on three different factors. Consistently high rates of missing responses to political efficacy items suggested that students did not understand the ideas expressed or that the language of the items was unclear to them. A content analysis of items on these two scales pointed to problems in the translatability of key concepts used repeatedly in the items.

Many of the original items on both the political efficacy and political confidence scales included the word "influence," which proved to be a particularly difficult concept to translate. The Japanese word that is closest in meaning to the word "influence" has a negative connotation, suggesting bribery or other underhanded methods of swaying the opinion of decision makers. It was also a term judged to be too difficult for middle

school students. Alternative words and phrases that were substituted for "influence" may have been inadequate to convey the strength of meaning in the original statements.

Another difficulty was the translation of the phrase "people in government." There is not an equivalent Japanese term that designates elected and appointed officials at all levels of government, nor is there a term with a meaning equivalent to "politician" that was deemed appropriate for the middle school students' reading vocabulary. Consequently, it was often necessary to include a cumbersome list of political figures in a statement, which undoubtedly produced conceptual confusion for the students. A political efficacy scale item which stated that "Citizens can influence decisions made by people in government by writing letters to their representatives," was back-translated from Japanese to read "If a national citizen writes a letter to a national diet member or a council member of a regional public body, s/he can affect decisions that are made in political places." It seemed likely that students had difficulty relating the actors and actions in this sentence in a meaningful way. Almost 20% of the students didn't make an effort to do so.

Both this item, which proposes that citizens can influence government policy by writing letters, and another political efficacy scale item, which states that citizens can participate in politics by attending community meetings, loaded on the cynicism towards authority scale. This suggests a certain level

of disbelief among the students in the sample regarding the ability of citizens to influence governmental affairs, an attitude which may be consistent with the Japanese concept of the citizen's limited, but proper role in Japan.

The following excerpt from an interview with a Japanese high school history teacher illustrates the different meanings that even such supposedly translatable concepts as 'democracy,' 'free speech,' and 'participation' have for the Japanese:

> Interviewer: What do you think the word democracy means to Japanese people?
>
> Teacher: When he hears the word democracy, he immediately thinks about the majority system, the voting system. In Japan what is most important is meeting and discussion, so it's not so important to talk about matters, to express. . .Free talking or free expression isn't so important, but the fact that the people gather is most important, and it's called democracy. Expressing ourselves freely is not so important.
>
> I: It's hard for me to understand a discussion that does not have free expression in it. What kind of discussion is it when people come together?
>
> T: In Japan what is most important is participation. Everyone participates in the meeting. The fact that everyone participates is important. So what they talk

about isn't so important. Exchanging information of views is in a way important, of course; but the final decision is always up to the boss or someone in charge.

I: So they participate by coming together. To me democracy and participation go together. How do people participate? By just coming together and being together, not speaking so much?

T: In a Japanese conference, the boss or someone has the original scenario or plan and usually the participants agree to the plan. No opposition. Of course they exchange views, but finally they agree with the plan. Being present in the place is very important.

I: Is that how people participate in politics?

T: Yes. Therefore, the many young people are apathetic about politics. And the LDP, the ruling party--their bill is always passed in the Diet, so many young people are not interested in politics.

Judging by the poor performance of most items on the a priori scales of political efficacy and political confidence, it may be that the behaviors assumed by westerners to characterize political efficacy are not culturally acceptable behaviors for Japanese citizens at all. In fact, it appears that many Japanese experience a conflict between their support for democratic principles and their desire to conform to cultural norms. As a

Japanese middle school English teacher explained: "If a person is my senior, I can't speak freely. . .In Japan we can't speak frankly because it's rude. It's not a good custom, but it's a custom. I want to speak frankly, but I can't." Statements such as this cast further doubt upon the viability of certain western constructs as measures of Japanese political attitudes.

Translation difficulties undoubtedly weakened the content validity of the political efficacy and political confidence scale items in this field test. However, there was no evidence to support political efficacy or political confidence as operable constructs in the framework of the political attitudes of the students in this sample. This suggests that the concept of the citizen as an active and influential participant in the political process may not be meaningful within the Japanese cultural context. It also supports van Wolferen's assertion that the Japanese people, having been subjects rather than citizens for centuries, have not developed a concept of participatory citizenship.

Although the items that loaded on the first good citizen factor were all indicators of active citizenship, a closer examination of the response frequencies on those items is instructive. At least half of the students said that four of the active citizenship behaviors associated with the factor had no relationship to citizenship. Fifty percent said that voting had no relationship to good citizenship, 50% said belonging to a

political party had nothing to do with being a good citizen, 61% said that knowing what taxes are spent for had no relationship to citizenship, and 57% said that belonging to a labor union was not related to good citizenship. The final item on this list seldom falls into the westerner's definition of good citizenship either; however, labor unions have a particularly negative connotation in Japan because they represent groups who actively take issue with government policy and authority, and advocate change. Although the students in this study expressed covert cynicism towards authority, their rejection of labor union membership as a good citizenship behavior indicates that they have learned the impropriety of overt resistance to authority. According to the Japanese middle school students in this sample, good citizenship is not associated with voting, being informed, being politically affiliated, or dissenting, but rather with being loyal to one's family, doing one's best and being considerate of others.

Implications for Social Studies Educators

Japan shares with other democratic nations a concern for the education of her future citizens. Indeed, the aim expressed by the Japanese Ministry of Education (1983)--"to develop basic civic qualities essential to the builders of a democratic and peaceful nation"--appears remarkably consistent with goals of citizenship education advanced by social studies educators in the United States. However, the results of this study imply that, whereas educators in both countries ostensibly aim to prepare

citizens for democracy, there are important differences in how we conceptualize democracy itself along with concepts of democratic principles such as free expression, participation, and the responsibilities of good citizens. In a field where familiar nomenclature may be applied to essentially foreign concepts, United States educators, as well as Japanese educators, should exercise caution in aiming to match one another's methods and standards. Because citizenship education is embedded within the total educational process, a consideration of potential costs in terms of unintended outcomes seems prudent when appropriating educational practices or striving to match one another's performances in selected areas. In many cases, Japanese educational practices, however well-suited they may be to the preparation of students for future citizenship in Japan, may lead toward ends that are antithetical to the civic qualities that we deem essential to democratic citizenship in the United States.

References

Abraham, K. G. (1983). Political thinking in the elementary years: An empirical study. Elementary School Journal, 84, 221-231.

Allman-Snyder, A., May, M. J., & Garcia, F. C. (1975). Classroom structure and children's perceptions of authority: An open and closed case. Urban Education, 10, 131-149.

Angell, Ann V. (1990). Democratic climate and elementary classrooms: A review of theory and research. Unpublished manuscript, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

Berman, D. M. (1990). Social studies education for the new Japan. Social Education, 54(4), 242-243.

Blankenship, G. (1989) Classroom climate, global knowledge, global attitudes, and political attitudes. Unpublished dissertation, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

Connell, R. W. (1971). The child's construction of politics. Victoria: Melbourne University Press.

Cummings, W. (1980). Education and equality in Japan. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Dillon, S. V., & Grout, J. A. (1976). Schools and alienation. Elementary School Journal, 76, 481-489.

Duke, B. (1986). The Japanese school: Lessons for Industrial America. New York: Praeger.

Easton, D., & Dennis, J. (1968). The child's acquisition of regime norms: Political efficacy. The American Political Science Review, 61, 25-38.

Ehman, L. H. (1969). An analysis of the relationships of selected educational variables with the political socialization of high school students. American Educational Research Association, 69, 559-580.

Ehman, L. H. (1970). A comparison of three sources of classroom data: Teachers, students and systematic observation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Minneapolis, MN.

Ehman, L. H. (1980a). The American school in the political socialization process. Review of Educational Research, 50, 99-119.

Ehman, L. H. (1980b). Change in high school students' political attitudes as a function of social studies classroom climate. American Educational Research Journal, 17, 253-265.

Frey, F. W. (1976). Cross-cultural survey research in political science. In R. T. Holt & J. E. Turner (Eds.), The methodology of comparative research (pp. 173-279). New York: Free Press.

Glenn, A. D. (1972). Elementary school children's attitudes toward politics. In B. G. Massialas (Ed.), Political youth, traditional schools: National and international perspectives, (pp. 51-63). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Greenstein, F. I. (1965). Children and politics. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Grossman, D. L. (1975). Educational climates and attitudes toward dissent: A study of political socialization of conflict norms in adolescents. Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 1980.

Hahn, C. L., Tocci, C., & Angell, A. (1988). Five nation study of civic attitudes and controversial issues discussions. Paper presented at the International Conference on the Social Studies, Vancouver, BC.

Harwood, A. (1989). Effects of Close Up program. Unpublished master's thesis, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

Hawley, W. D. (1977). Reforming the civics curriculum through restructuring of teacher behavior. The American Political Science Review, 71, 319-325.

Hawley, W. D., & Eyler, J. (1983). Teacher behavior and interest in the ideas of others: A demonstration of the influence of teachers on students' democratic values. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

Hess, R.D., & Torney, J.V. (1967). The development of political attitudes in children. Chicago: Aldine Publishing.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Anderson, D. (1983). Social interdependence and classroom climate. The Journal of Psychology, 114, 135-142.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., Johnson, J., & Anderson, D. (1976). Effects of cooperative versus individualized instruction on student prosocial behavior, attitudes toward learning, and achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 68(4), 446-452.

Kurisaka, Y. (Autumn, 1989). Japanese women awake to politics. Japan Update, No. 13, 1-2.

Lickona, T. (1977). Creating the Just Community with children. Theory Into Practice, 16(2), 97-104.

Ministry of Education. (1983) Course of Study for Lower Secondary Schools in Japan. Science and Culture, Educational and Cultural Exchange Division, UNESCO and International Affairs Department, Science and International Affairs Bureau.

Moos, R. H. (1979). Evaluating educational environments. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Moore, S., Lare, J., & Wagner, K. (1985). The child's political world: A longitudinal perspective. New York: Praeger.

Murphy, D. F. (1988). The Just Community at Birch Meadow Elementary School. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 427-428.

Nakayama, S. (1989). A view from Japan. Social Education, 53, 156-158.

Oppenheim, A. N., & Torney, J. V. (1974). The measurement of children's civic attitudes in different nations (International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement Monograph Studies, No. 2.). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Parker, W., & Jarolimek, H. (1984). Citizenship and the critical role of the social studies. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies Bulletin No. 72.

Power, C. (1981). Moral education through the development of the moral atmosphere of the school. The Journal of Educational Thought, 15, 4-19.

Rohlen, T. P. (1983). Japan's high schools. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Rossell, C. H., & Hawley, W. D. (1981). The relationship between teacher behavior toward students and student political attitudes: The development of political cynicism. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Singleton, J. (1967). Nichu: A Japanese school. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Stevens, O. (1982). Children talking politics. Oxford: Martin Robertson.

Torney-Purta, J., & Lansdale, D. (1986). Classroom climate and process in international studies: Qualitative and quantitative evidence from the American schools and the world project, Stanford and the schools study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Torney, J., Oppenheim, A. N., & Farnen, R. F. (1975). Civic education in ten countries: An empirical study. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Van Wolferen, K. (1989). The enigma of Japanese power: People and politics in a stateless nation. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Walberg, H. J. (1976). Psychology of learning environments: Behavioral, structural or perceptual? In L. Shulman (Ed.), Review of research in education (Vol. 4). Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.

White, M. (1987). The Japanese educational challenge. New York: Free Press.

Wilkinson, L. (1988). SYSTAT: The system for statistics. Evanston, IL: SYSTAT, Inc.

Wray, H. (1989). Educational differences: Are Japanese schools better than American schools? Speaking of Japan, 10, 13-19.

Zahn, G. L., Kagan, S., & Widaman, K. F. (1986). Cooperative learning and classroom climate. Journal of School Psychology, 24 (4), 351-62.

Zellman, G. L., & Sears, D. O. (1971). Childhood origins of tolerance for dissent. Journal of Social Issues, 27(2), 109-135.

Zevin, J. (1983). Future citizens: Children and politics. Teaching Political Science, 10, 119-126.

Footnote

1. Harwood (1989) adapted items on the political confidence and political interest scales from measures that were developed by Ehman and Gillespie (1975) and used in subsequent studies conducted by Avery and Hahn (1985), Hahn, Tocci and Angell (1988), and Harper (1987). Items on the political efficacy scale were adapted from the scale used by Hahn et al. (1988) which included measures from the studies of Campbell (1960), Easton and Dennis (1969), Ehman (1972), Hess and Torney (1967), Jennings and Niemi (1974), and Mercer (1974) (Reported in Harwood, 1989, p. 17).

Appendix A: Civic Attitudes Questionnaire

Instructions (Adapted from Torney et al., 1975)

These questions have been given to a number of students in several countries to find out what they think. For these questions there are no right or wrong answers, so this is NOT a test. We just want to know what you think. Your answers are CONFIDENTIAL so be as truthful as you can. Please DO NOT write your name anywhere on this questionnaire.

PART I: A GOOD CITIZEN

Please read the following phrases carefully. Then, if you think the phrase describes a good citizen, please put a O under the heading "Good citizen." If you think the phrase describes someone who is not a good citizen, please put a O under the heading "Not a good citizen." If the phrase has nothing to do with your idea of a good citizen, put a O under the heading "Has no relationship to a good citizen." If you don't know whether the phrase describes a good or a bad citizen, put a O under "I don't know."

In questions 19 and 20, the O has already been put in a space. For question 19, please write one different way you would explain what a good citizen does. For question 20, please write one different way you would explain what a good citizen doesn't do.

Is this kind of person a good citizen?	Good citizen, I think	No relation-ship to g.c.	Not a good ctzn, I think	Don't know
1. Always obeys rules & laws				
2. Always observes manners				
3. Votes in every election				
4. Respects family				
5. Doesn't complain even when rules seem unfair				
6. Does everything to the best of his/her ability				
7. Speaks in an informal way to his/her superiors				

Is this kind of person a good citizen?	Good citizen, I think	No relation-ship to g.c.	Not a good ctzn, I think	Don't know
8. Knows what tax money is spent for				
9. Belongs to a labor union				
10. Respects traditional things 11. Changes one's opinion to agree with the opinion of the majority.				
12. Has good table manners				
13. Pays taxes regularly				
14. Tries to change things in the government				
15. Joins a political party				
16. Encourages other people to vote in elections				
17. Displays the flag on national holidays				
18. Knows about current events in the world				
19.	X			
20.			X	

PART II: POLITICAL ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF CLASSROOM CLIMATE

Response options to all of the following are: (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) slightly agree, (4) slightly disagree, (5) disagree, (6) strongly disagree

READER'S NOTE: Items organized on scales here are presented in random order on the questionnaire. Asterisked items indicate that the items were negatively stated, and therefore, were reversed for scoring. Each listing begins with the original English wording and source of the item; after the colon, the back-translation from Japanese is given (if it differs from the original) and particular difficulties in the translation are indicated by parenthetical comments.

Political Trust Scale (Harwood, 1989)

1. We can usually trust people who are in government to do what is right for the country: Country and regional council members are not always trustworthy to do what is good for the country.

2. People running the government are honest: National diet members and regional decision-making council members are honest.

3. People running the government are smart and usually know what they are doing: Most national diet members, city, town and village council members are smart; and usually know what they should do and how to do it.

4. I think that people in government care about what people like me and my family think: National and regional decision-making council members (people in government) care about what ordinary people like me and my family think.

*5. People in the government who are running the country don't care about the opinions of ordinary people: National parliament members, ministers (cabinet members), and city, town and village council members don't really think much about the opinions of ordinary people. (translation problem: people in government)

6. The government does not waste taxpayers' money: The government does not use taxpayers' money for useless purposes.

7. People in government care about what all of us think: National or regional councils care about what all of us think. (people in government)

Political Efficacy Scale (Adapted from Harwood, 1989)

*1. The way people vote does not affect how things are run in this country: How a person votes has little relationship to how things are run in this country.

2. Citizens can influence decisions made in government by joining a demonstration to protest policies they don't like: Decisions made in political places which you can't agree with can be changed by participating in a demonstration to protest policies you don't agree with. (clumsy to include pronoun; ambiguous without)

3. What happens in government is influenced by people expressing their opinions on political issues: What is decided in political places reflects the opinions of the ordinary people.

4. If citizens write letters to their representatives, they can influence the decisions made in government: If a national citizen writes a letter to a national diet member or a council member of a regional public body, s/he can affect decisions that are made in political places.

5. People can influence the way government is run by working to get candidates elected: People can participate in politics by campaigning. (influence replaced by participate. . .inadequate, but "influence" proved a particularly difficult concept to translate)

6. People can influence government by attending community meetings to talk with government officials: People can participate in politics by attending community meetings to talk with council members. (influence)

7. Regular elections in our nation are unnecessary (Torney et al., 1975): Regular general (national citizens') elections are unnecessary.

*8. Government matters should be left to experts (Torney et al., 1975): Political matters should be left to political specialists.

Political Confidence Scale (Harwood, 1989)

*1. I am not able to influence decisions in groups: I do not have the power to decide what the group decides.

2. Although it is not the most popular thing to do, I can often get my way in groups: Even though it differs from most people's thinking, I can usually push through my way and persuade people.

*3. I am not the kind of person who can influence how other people decide to vote in elections: I don't have the power to exert influence when other people are deciding what kind of person they will vote for in an election.

4. I sometimes take leadership roles in decision-making situations: When something is being decided, I sometimes take a leadership role.

*5. So many people vote in a general election that when I grow up it will not matter much whether I vote or not (Torney et al., 1975): So many people vote in various elections that when I am an adult, it will not matter very much whether I vote or not.

Political Interest Scale (Harwood, 1989)

1. I would enjoy having lessons where politics and government are discussed: I could be interested in civics or social studies lessons in which politics or government are explained. (discussed replaced by explained at insistence of two advisors on two separate occasions, both confident that the word discussion was not appropriate in describing a lesson--that discussions would never be held during a lesson.)

2. I am usually curious about political matters: I am very interested in politics.

3. I would like to know more about how political parties work: I think I would like to know more about how political parties work.

*4. I don't think I would enjoy being involved in making decisions which affect my community: I don't think I would enjoy being involved in making decisions which affect my community.

*5. I don't think hearing about political figures and events is interesting: I don't think hearing about political figures and events is interesting.

6. I don't try to keep up with what is happening in politics: I, right now, don't want to know about what political things are happening.

Classroom Climate Scale

1. Our teachers respect our opinions and encourage us to express them (Torney et al., 1975): Teachers respect our opinions and encourage us to say them.

*2. Students feel uncomfortable expressing their opinions if their opinions are different from the teacher's opinion. (Adapted from Harwood, 1989): Students in our class become reluctant to express their opinions when they know their opinions are different from the teacher's opinion.

3. In my classes we discuss political, economic and social issues often (Adapted from Harwood, 1989): In my classes we have discussions about political, economic and social issues.

4. When we have discussions in class, we are encouraged to consider different points of view (Adapted from Harwood, 1989): When we discuss student life in class, we are guided to think of things from different points of view (only student life is discussed).

5. Our teachers present more than one side to an issue when explaining it in class (Adapted from Harwood, 1989): Our teachers give explanations from many different points of view when we are talking about a problem in class.

7. Every member of our class has the same privileges (Torney et al., 1975): Every member of our class has the same rights and privileges.

*8. Teachers overlook weaker students (Adapted from Torney et al., 1975): Teachers are too busy to help weak students.

Social Integration Scale

*1. I don't have many friends in this class (Zahn et al., 1986).

*2. I don't want to be friends with many of the students in this class (Zahn et al., 1986): There are many students in this class that I don't really want to be friends with.

3. Students in this class get to know each other really well (Moos, 1979): Students in this class gradually get to know each other really well.

*4. It takes a long time to get to know everybody by name in this class (Moos, 1979): It takes a long time to get to know everybody's name in this class.

*5. There are groups of students who don't get along in this class.

*6. The only people who are important to me are my closest friends and my family (Ehman, 1969): The only people who are important to me are my closest friends and my family.

7. I can't always do exactly what I want because my actions affect others (Ehman, 1969): I can't do what I want because the way I behave influences other people.

*8. How other people behave doesn't affect me. (Ehman, 1969): How other people behave has no relationship to me.

Freedom of Expression Scale

*1. A newspaper which writes a communist attack on our government should be punished (Hahn et al., 1988): A newspaper which criticizes Japan's policy, in opposition to the government, should be suppressed.

2. If a communist wanted to make a speech in our town, he or she should be allowed to speak (Hahn et al., 1988): If a person who opposed our government wanted to make a speech in our town, he or she should be allowed to speak.

3. Newspapers and magazines should be allowed to print anything they want except military secrets (Hahn et al., 1988): Newspapers and magazines should be allowed to write anything they want. (taking out "except" phrase was more appropriate to Japan, but weakened the item)

4. Citizens must always be free to criticize the government (Torney et al., 1975): (National citizens) citizens should be allowed to freely criticize the thinking of national and regional government decision-making bodies.

*5. People should not criticize the government, it only interrupts the government's work (Torney et al., 1975): People should not be allowed to criticize the national or regional councils. ("it only interrupts the government's work" ommitted.)

6. It is wrong to criticize our government (Torney et al., 1975): It is wrong to criticize one's own government.

7. People who disagree with the government should be allowed to meet and hold public protests (Torney et al., 1975): Even people who oppose laws made by the government should be allowed to meet and talk about the laws and freely make public presentations of their own opinions.

Freedom from Censure

1. Most people say and do what they think is best without worrying about what other people think.

2. Most people are not afraid to express themselves when they disagree with the majority.

*3. Many people are unkind to people who express opinions opposite to everyone else's.

*4. Sometimes people don't feel comfortable doing what they want to do because they worry that they will be spoken about badly.

5. Most people encourage others to think for themselves and to express their own opinions.

6. Often people don't say what they really think (in their hearts) because they don't want to lose friends.

Note. Back-translations did not differ from original items on this scale because the wording of the original items was selected with the help of the translator.

PART III: FUTURE PARTICIPATION

Instructions: This section asks questions about how you expect to participate as an adult citizen. Please choose from the four answers at the top and write the number of the response that best describes what you think in front of questions 1-8.

1) I definitely will 2) I might 3) I probably won't 4) I definitely won't

How likely do you think it will be that you will:

_____1. Vote in a general election?
_____2. Vote in a local election?
_____3. Work to get a political candidate elected?
_____4. Write a letter or make a phone call to a government official to express your opinion?
_____5. Participate in a demonstration to protest a policy you don't like?
_____6. Join a political party or organization?
_____7. Run for public office?
_____8. Attend community meetings to talk with government officials?

PART IV: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Instructions: This section is designed to help us learn more about you. If you answer these questions it will be very useful for us. Please write the number of the appropriate response in the blank provided before each number.

_____1. What kind of scores do you usually receive in your classes?
1) 90-100 2) 80-90 3) 60-80 4) 40-60 5) 20-40

_____2. Do you plan to go to high school?
1) Yes 2) No

_____3. What was the highest level of schooling completed by your father?
1) Elementary school 2) Junior high school 3) High school
4) Junior college 5) 4-year university 6) Graduate school

_____4. What was the highest level of schooling completed by your mother?
1) Elementary school 2) Junior high school 3) High school
4) Junior college 5) 4-year university 6) Graduate school

6. Please write your father's occupation_____.

7. Please write your mother's occupation_____.

APPENDIX B: Tolerance for Diversity Scale
(Adapted from Torney et al., 1975)

There are many different people in Japan. Do you think they should all have the same rights and freedoms, or should they be treated differently? For each group listed below, please mark X under the heading that shows how you think they should be treated.

They should have:	More rights and freedoms than other people	Exactly the same as other people	Fewer rights and freedoms than other people	I don't know
1. Doctors				
2. Communists				
3. Religious leaders				
4. Koreans				
5. Leaders of big corporations				
6. Women				
7. Government leaders				
8. Discharged prisoners				
9. Burakumin				
10. Homeless people				
11. Yakuza				
12. Police				
13. Office ladies				
14. People with anti-Japan attitudes				

Appendix C: Directions for Administering the Questionnaire

Please give out the questionnaires face down. Ask students not to turn them over until you tell them to begin the questionnaire.

1. INTRODUCE THE QUESTIONNAIRE

   * The questionnaire is being given to junior high school students in many countries.

   * It asks your opinions about many different subjects.

   * There are no right or wrong answers.

   * Please answer as honestly as possible.

2. EMPHASIZE CONFIDENTIALITY

   * There will be no names on the questionnaires.

   * The teacher will not walk among desks.

   * Students will put their questionnaires in the envelope and the last student will seal the envelope.

   * No one will know which answers are yours, so please answer as frankly as possible.

3. EXPLAIN RULES

   * DO NOT write your name anywhere on the papers.

   * DO NOT talk with other students or look at their papers.

   * There are about 85 questions, so don't spend too much time thinking about each one.

   * If you do not understand a question, you may leave it blank.

   * The teacher will not answer questions after you begin.

   * When you finish, put your paper face down in the envelope.

   * The last student to finish should close the envelope.

4. ASK IF THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS

5. TELL STUDENTS TO BEGIN

Appendix D: The Civics Attitudes Questionnaire

(translated for Japanese Middle School Students)

アンケート

学校名	中学校	
学年	年　組	男・女

このアンケートは、いろいろな国の生徒が、どの様に考えているかを理解するために行うものです。これらの質問には、正しい答えも、正しくない答えもありません。又、これは、テストではありません。私達は、世界の子供達が、どの様に考えているのかを知りたいために、行います。このアンケートは、無記名で行われますから、できるだけよく考えて、本当に思ったことをかいて下さい。

繰り返しますが、どの欄(らん)にも名前を書き入れる場所はありません。

次の欄(らん)をよく読んで下さい。

もしその項目が、いい国民だ、と思ったら、「いい国民」のところに○印をつけて下さい。その項目が、いい国民ではないと思ったら、「いい国民ではない」のところに○印をつけて下さい。もし、あなたの考えるいい国民と、関係がないと思ったら、「いい国民とあまり関係がない」のところに○印をつけて下さい。又、いい国民か、いい国民ではないか、わからなかったら、「わからない」のところに○印をつけて下さい。

質問の中で、19と、20は、すでに、○印がついています。

19番目の欄(らん)には、いい国民は、こんなことをするだろう、と思う、あなたの意見を、具体的な例をあげて書いて下さい。

20番目の欄(らん)には、いい国民はこんな事をしないだろう、と思うあなたの意見を具体的な例をあげて書いて下さい。

	こんな人は、いい国民ですか?	いい国民だと思う	いい国民とあまり関係がないと思う	いい国民ではないと思う	わからない
1	いつも法律や規則を守る人				
2	いつもあいさつをする人				
3	選挙にいつも投票にいく人				
4	家族を大切にする人				
5	法律や規則が不公平だと思ってもとやかく言わない人				
6	何でも一生懸命する人				
7	目上の人にも親しく話す人				
8	税金が何のために使われているかよく知っている人				
9	労働組合に加盟している人				
10	伝統的な物を大切にする人				
11	大勢の人に反対されると、自分の意見を変える人				
12	食事の作法を守る人				
13	町内の行事に参加する人				
14	政治に参加するために努力している人				
15	政党に加盟する人				
16	選挙に行くようすすめる人				
17	祝祭日に国旗をあげる人				
18	いま、世界で起こっているでき事をよく知っている人				
19		○			
20				○	

第二部

1～55の文章を、よく読んで下さい。そしてあなたの意見を右の6つの中から選んで、その欄(ラン)に○印をつけてください。
もし、問題の意味がわからない時は、答えなくてもよろしい。

		強くそう思う	そう思う	少しそう思う	あまり思わない	そう思わない	全然思わない
1	政治や議会について説明されている、「公民」の授業や、「社会科」の授業に、興味を持つことができる。						
2	選挙でどうしてこの人を選んだか、ということは、この国の政治がどんなふうに行われているか、ということにはあまり関係がない。						
3	学校生活のことで討議する時は、いろいろな観点から考えるように、先生が指導してくれている。						
4	クラスの生徒の大多数と友達になりたくない。						
5	国会議員や、市町村の議員はみんな頭がよくて、何をしなければならないか、どうやってしたらよいかを、いつもわかってやっている。						
6	政府の作った法律に反対している人々も、法律について話し合ったり、自分の意見を自由に人々に発表しても許されるべきだ。						
7	このクラスには、お互いにうまくいっていないグループがある。						
8	自分の意見が世の中の考え方と違う時でも、割と自分のやり方を通せるし、みんなを説得することもできる。						
9	このクラスでは、お互いについて　だんだんよくわかり合って来ている。						
10	いろいろな選挙にたくさんの人が投票しているので、私が大人になった時、自分一人ぐらい投票するかしないかは、あまり問題ではない。						
11	大多数の人々は、他人がどう思っているかを気にしないで、自分が最もよいと思うことを言ったり行動したりできる。						
12	政府の考え方に反対する立場に立って、日本の政策について批判している新聞は、弾圧(ダンアツ)されるべきだ。						
13	先生が反対だとわかっている時、クラスの生徒は自分達の意見をいいたくなくなる。						
14	政治の場で決定されていることは、住民の意見が反映されている。						
15	多数派の意見に反対する時、多くの人々は反対の意見を言うことを、恐れない。						
16	国会議員や、大臣や、各市町村の議員は、住民の意見についてあまり考えていない。						
17	クラスの生徒は、皆同じ権利や義務を持っている。						
18	国や地方公共団体の議員が国のために良いことをしていると、いつも信じているわけではない。						

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

		強くそう思う	そう思う	少しそう思う	あまり思わない	そう思わない	全然思わない
19	政治の場で決められたことで賛成できないことは、デモに参加して、政府の決定を変えさせることができる。						
20	私達の先生は、私達の意見を大切にし、意見を言うことを勇気づけてくれる。						
21	大多数の人々は、みんなと反対の意見を言う人に対してあまり好意的ではない。						
22	国民は、国や地方公共団体の考え方について、自由に批判しても許されるべきだ。						
23	もし国民が、国会議員や地方公共団体の議員に手紙を書いたら、政治の場で決定されたことに影響を及ぼすことができる。						
24	国会議員や地方公共団体の議員は、正直である。						
25	自分の国の政治を批判することは、良くないことだ。						
26	私は、他の人が選挙でどんな人を選ぶかを決める時、影響を及ぼす力を持っている。						
27	先生が、クラスである問題について話す時、いろいろな見方で説明してくれる。						
28	私にとって大切な人は、ごく親しい友人と家族だけである。						
29	私は、政治に大変興味がある。						
30	私の行動は何らかの形で他の人に影響するから、思った通りできない。						
31	もし、政府の考え方に反対する人が、我々の町で講演会を開きたいと思えば、許されるべきだ。						
32	私は、政党がどんな考え方で政治を行っているかについて、もっと知りたいと思っている。						
33	人々は、選挙運動をすることで、政治に参加することができる。						
34	国や地方公共団体の人々は、私や私の家族のような一般の人の考えていることについて、気を使っている。						
35	政治的なことは、政治の専門家に任せるべきだ。						
36	私は、私達の町を動かすような決定に参加したいと思っている。						
37	クラスで私達は、よく政治や経済や社会問題について討議している。						

		強くそう思う	そう思う	少しそう思う	あまり思わない	そう思わない	全然思わない
38	国や地方公共団体は、税金を払っている人達のお金を、無駄に使ってはいない。						
39	人々は、他人に悪く言われるのが恐いので時々したいことができない。						
40	私は、今、どんな政治的なできごとが起こっているかについてあまり知りたくない。						
41	人々は、議員と話す会合に出席することで、政治に参加できる。						
42	国民総選挙は、必要ではない。						
43	何か決めたい時、時々私がリーダーになる。						
44	政治家や政治的なできごとについて聞くのは、面白くない。						
45	私達の先生は、私達の意見を大切にし、意見を言うことを勇気づけてくれる。						
46	友達を失いたくないので、人々は心に思っていても言わないことが、時々ある。						
47	このクラスで、全員の名前を覚えるのに長い時間がかかる。						
48	他の人がどんな風にしようと、私には関係がない。						
49	新聞や雑誌は、どんなことを書いても許されるべきだ。						
50	国民は、国や地方公共団体について、批判するべきではない。						
51	知能が低い生徒の世話をするとしたら、先生方は忙しすぎる。						
52	私はグループの中で、何かを決定する力を持っていない。						
53	クラスに、友達があまりいない。						
54	国や地方公共団体は、私達全ての意見について、気を使っている。						
55	大多数の人々は、他の人に、自分でよく考えて自分の本当の意見を言うことをすすめている。						

第三部

これは、「あなたが大人だったら、どんな風にするか。」についての質問です。質問は１～８まであります。
①～④の答えの項目を見て下さい。
質問をよく読んでから、あなたの思う答えを、①～④から選び、１～８の回答欄に書いて下さい。

・あなたが大人だったら、どうしますか。
① 絶対する ② 多分する ③ 多分しない ④ 絶対しない

1		総選挙で投票する。
2		地方選挙で投票する。
3		自分の応援する立候補者のために選挙運動をする。
4		議員や大臣に自分の意見を伝えるために、手紙を書いたり、電話をかけたりする。
5		賛成できない法律や政策に反対するため、デモ行進に参加する。
6		政治的な団体や、政党に加盟する。
7		議員や大臣になるために努力する。
8		議員や大臣と話す会合があれば、出席する。

次の回答は参考資料として必要なので、差し支えなかったら書いて下さい。 それぞれの質問には、いくつか回答の項目があります。その中から、当てはまるものを選んで、１～４の質問の前の欄に書いて下さい。
５、６の質問の欄は、＿＿ に回答して下さい。

1		あなたの成績はクラスの中で、上からどのくらいですか。 ①100-90% ②90-80% ③80-60% ④60-40% ⑤40-20%
2		高校へ進学する予定ですか。 ①はい ②いいえ
3		あなたのお父さんの最終学歴は‥‥ ①小学校 ②中学校 ③高等学校 ④短期大学 ⑤四年制大学 ⑥大学院
4		あなたのお母さんの最終学歴は‥‥ ①小学校 ②中学校 ③高等学校 ④短期大学 ⑤四年制大学 ⑥大学院
5	あなたのお父さんの職業は‥‥ ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿	
6	あなたのお母さんの職業は‥‥ ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿	

ご協力どうもありがとうございました。
このアンケートの結果は、大学での私の研究の、かけがえのない資料となります。みなさまの回答は、国際理解を深める上で、大きく貢献してくれると思います。本当にありがとうございました。

アメリカ・ジョージア州・アトランタ市
エモリー大学・学生 アン・エンジェル

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix E: Rotated Factor Structures--54 Attitude Statement Items*

	1	2	3	4	5	6
POL50	**0.794**	0.036	0.103	0.150	0.318	0.038
POL25	**0.793**	-0.107	0.133	0.161	0.073	-0.136
POL6	**0.786**	0.038	-0.102	0.021	-0.098	0.201
POL22	**0.741**	-0.084	-0.011	-0.213	-0.038	0.140
POL31	**0.717**	-0.022	0.107	0.057	-0.022	0.005
POL12	**0.651**	-0.361	0.095	0.257	-0.155	0.062
POL35	**0.563**	-0.112	0.180	0.044	0.166	0.391
POL10	**0.551**	-0.141	0.220	0.164	-0.186	0.107
POL51	0.505	0.012	-0.252	-0.039	0.307	-0.174
POL54	-0.052	**0.785**	-0.066	0.293	-0.010	0.003
POL20	-0.123	**0.727**	0.029	0.250	-0.125	0.312
POL24	-0.090	**0.674**	0.081	0.247	-0.086	-0.069
POL34	0.032	**0.625**	-0.030	0.168	0.092	-0.228
POL41	0.169	**0.603**	0.183	-0.080	-0.100	-0.118
POL5	-0.061	**0.596**	-0.119	0.193	0.078	-0.122
POL3	0.056	**0.570**	0.160	-0.037	-0.211	0.187
POL27	-0.478	**0.543**	0.093	0.216	-0.008	0.169
POL23	-0.091	**0.532**	-0.112	-0.228	-0.130	-0.084
POL44	0.080	0.114	**0.765**	0.013	-0.249	-0.189
POL1	-0.010	0.097	**0.701**	-0.020	0.119	0.075
POL29	0.049	0.034	**0.694**	0.151	-0.330	-0.104
POL40	0.071	-0.139	**0.635**	-0.105	-0.106	0.054
POL32	0.157	0.094	**0.628**	0.019	-0.455	-0.041

POL2	-0.084	0.064	0.592	0.304	0.385	-0.124
POL42	0.133	-0.074	0.507	-0.223	0.141	0.074
POL30	-0.078	0.281	-0.149	**-0.633**	0.026	-0.206
POL15	-0.098	-0.156	0.022	**-0.589**	0.053	0.225
POL16	-0.062	0.254	0.067	0.502	0.089	0.090
POL37	0.151	0.311	-0.005	-0.282	**-0.670**	-0.013
POL47	0.041	0.069	-0.050	-0.050	**0.630**	-0.171
POL26	-0.236	0.087	-0.005	0.090	**-0.559**	-0.032
POL48	0.093	0.212	-0.143	0.073	**0.509**	0.146
POL17	0.357	0.160	-0.050	0.343	**0.502**	-0.025
POL53	0.115	-0.048	-0.221	0.233	0.118	**0.799**
POL7	0.160	0.094	0.000	0.162	0.044	**0.656**
POL52	0.002	-0.183	0.046	-0.203	-0.207	**0.629**
POL19	0.286	0.149	0.160	**-0.440**	0.014	0.431
POL49	0.133	0.112	0.048	-0.109	-0.329	-0.371
POL9	0.400	0.191	-0.069	0.356	-0.086	0.321
POL28	0.434	0.065	-0.071	0.210	0.107	0.316
POL14	-0.114	0.398	0.091	-0.088	0.330	0.296
POL55	0.114	**0.472**	-0.200	-0.078	0.414	0.284
POL11	-0.146	-0.063	-0.131	**-0.367**	0.199	-0.259
POL4	0.352	0.396	0.059	-0.144	0.170	0.245
POL33	0.349	0.377	0.057	-0.136	0.014	-0.245
POL21	0.115	0.159	-0.068	0.413	-0.005	0.185
POL18	-0.218	0.301	0.044	0.015	0.314	0.164
POL8	0.297	-0.079	0.094	-0.344	-0.052	-0.133

POL39	0.117	0.287	-0.264	0.457	0.067	-0.069
POL13	0.157	0.119	0.116	0.256	-0.429	-0.034
POL36	0.403	0.048	0.215	-0.347	-0.291	0.033
POL46	0.299	0.186	-0.015	-0.129	-0.067	-0.020
POL38	-0.098	**0.447**	-0.234	0.183	0.186	0.014
POL43	0.049	0.257	-0.380	0.035	-0.410	0.012

*Boldface indicates those items which were included on factor-based scales

---

Percent of total variance explained by rotated components:

1	2	3	4	5	6
11.238	10.244	7.092	6.272	6.993	5.918

Appendix F: Attitude Items Retained on Six Factor-based Scales

Factor 1: Free expression

Item	Loading	Statement
50*	.794	People should not be allowed to criticize the national or regional councils.
25*	.793	It is wrong to criticize one's own government.
6	.786	Even people who oppose laws made by the government should be allowed to meet and talk about the laws and freely make public presentations of their own opinions.
22	.741	Citizens should be allowed to freely criticize the thinking of national and regional government decision-making bodies.
31	.717	If a person who opposed our government wanted to make a speech in our town, he or she should be allowed to speak.
12*	.651	A newspaper which criticizes Japan's policy, in opposition to the government, should be suppressed.
35*	.563	Political matters should be left to political specialists.
10*	.551	So many people vote in various elections that when I am an adult, it will not matter very much whether I vote or not.

Factor 2: Cynicism towards authority

Item	Loading	Statement
54	.785	National or regional council members care about what all of us think.
20	.727	Teachers respect our opinions and encourage us to say them.
24	.674	National diet members and regional decision-making council members are honest.

Factor 2: Cynicism towards authority (cont)

34	.625	National and regional decision-making council members care about what ordinary people like me and my family think.
41	.603	People can participate in politics by attending community meetings to talk with council members.
5	.596	Most national diet members, city, town and village council members are smart; they usually know what they should do and how to do it.
3	.570	When we discuss student life in class, we are guided to think of things from different points of view.
27	.543	Our teachers give explanations from many different points of view when we are talking about a problem in class.
23	.532	If a national citizen writes a letter to a national diet member or a council member of a regional public body, s/he can affect decisions that are made in political places.
55	.472	Most people encourage others to think for themselves and to express their own opinions.
38	.447	The government does not use taxpayers' money for useless purposes.

Factor 3: Political interest

Item	Loading	Statement
44*	.765	I don't think hearing about political figures and events is interesting.
1	.701	I could be interested in civics or social studies lessons in which politics or government are explained.
29	.694	I am very interested in politics.

Factor 3: Political interest (cont)

Item	Loading	Statement
40*	.635	I, right now, don't want to know about what political things are happening.
32	.628	I think I would like to know more about how political parties work.

Factor 4: Fear of censure

Item	Loading	Statement
30	-.633	I can't do what I want because the way I behave influences other people.
15	-.589	Most people are not afraid to express themselves when they disagree with the majority.
19	-.440	Decisions made in political places which you can't agree with can be changed by participating in a demonstration to protest policies you don't agree with.
11	-.367	Most people say and do what they think is best without worrying about what other people think.

Factor 5: Foolish questions

Item	Loading	Statement
37	-.670	In my classes we discuss political, economic, and social issues.
47*	.630	It takes a long time to get to know everyone's name in this class.
26	-.559	I have the power to exert influence when other people are deciding what kind of person they will vote for in an election.

Factor 5: Foolish questions (cont)

Item	Loading	Statement
48*	.509	How other people behave has no relationship to me.
17	.502	Every member of our class has the same rights and privileges.

Factor 6: Social integration

Item	Loading	Statement
53*	.799	I don't have many friends in this class.
7*	.656	There are groups of students who don't get along well in this class.
52*	.629	I am not able to decide things in groups.

*Indicates items which were reversed for scoring.

Appendix G: Summary of Item Weaknesses and Recommendations for Revisions

Classroom climate scale items

# Item	Factor/ loading	% No answer	Problem and recommendation for improvement
51 Teachers are too busy to help weaker students. status.	FE/ .551	14%	Mixed dimensions: students saw fairness issue before Concept is unfamiliar, probably undiscussed.
20 Teachers respect our opinions and encourage us to speak them.	CYN/ .727	4%	Teacher attitude and teacher behavior both present; revise to create two items.
3 When we discuss student life in class, we are guided to think of things from different points of view.	CYN/ .570	20%	"Discuss" is poorly understood, out of context. Teacher behavior is implied along with "how we think." Revise to create two items.
27 Our teachers give explanations from many different points of view when we are talking about a problem in class.	CYN/ .543	10%	"When we are talking about a problem in class" must be puzzling to students; drop it from item.
13 Students in our class are reluctant to express their opinions when it is different from the teacher's opinion.	FQ/ -.429	8%	Detracted from reliability of factor-based scale. Judgment of others' feelings together with situational dimension is too much. Simplify by dropping "when it is different. . ."

Freedom from censure scale items

# Item	Factor/ loading	% No answer	Problem and recommendation for improvement
11 Most people say and do what they think is best without worrying about what other people think.	FC/ -.367	9%	Two dimensions; how people behave and how they feel. Revise by creating two items.
21 Many people are unkind to people who express opinions opposite to everyone else's.	FC/ .413	10%	Detracted from reliability of factor-based scale. Phrasing may simply be too difficult. Simplify translation.
39 Sometimes people can't do what they want to do because they are afraid that they will be spoken about badly by others.	FC/ .457	6%	Detracted from reliability of factor-based scale. Behavior and feelings give mixed dimensions. Revise by creating two items.
46 Often people don't say what they really think because they don't want to lose friends.	FE/ .299	6%	Free expression dominates, but also censure and social dimensions. Causal phrases in this and #39 cloud meaning. Drop and make item positive.
55 Most people encourage others to think for themselves and to express their opinions	Loads weak-ly on 4 Fs.	17%	Comprehension problem. Two ideas--thinking for oneself & expressing opinions--suggest creation of two items. Also need more specific referents for "most people" and "others."

Political efficacy scale items

# Item	Factor/ loading	% No answer	Problem and recommendation for improvement
35 Political matters should be left to political specialists.	FE/ .563	12%	Higher percentage of no answer among first graders suggests the concepts are difficult. Improve translation of "political matters" and "political specialists."
41 People can participate in politics by attending community meetings to talk with council members.	CYN/ .603	15%	Translation of "influence" to "can participate" weakened the efficacy dimension. Relationship of three ideas--participate, attend community meetings and talk with politicians--is confusing; Drop "talk with council members."
23 If a national citizen writes a letter to a national diet member or a council member of a regional public body, s/he can affect decisions that are made in political places.	CYN/ .532	13%	Disbelief and indication of lack of understanding. Maybe because the behavior is so completely unfamiliar. Also translation problems--"people in government" & "influence"--- are evident. Drop item.
2 How a person votes doesn't affect how things are run in this country.	PI/ .592	17%	"How things are run" and "influence" were translation problems; maybe not adequately solved. Improve translation.
42 Regular elections are unnecessary in Japan.	PI/ .507	8%	"Unnecessary" in translation may be too vague; also strengthen meaning by stating positively.

Political efficacy scale items (cont)

# Item	Factor/ loading	% No answer	Problem and recommendation for improvement
19 Decisions made in political places which you can't agree with can be changed by participating in a demonstration.	FC/ -.440	14%	Loss of pronouns in the translation weakened the efficacy dimension. Strengthen with "citizens can" and omit "which you can't agree with."
14 What is decided in political places reflects the opinions of ordinary people.	Weak on 3 Fs.	25%	Comprehension problems. Maybe "political places" too vague. "Reflects" is poor translation of "influences." Work on translation.
33 People can participate in politics by campaigning.	Weak on FE and CYN	15%	Again participate is poor translation for "influence." Work on translation.

Political confidence scale items

# Item	Factor/ loading	% No answer	Problem and recommendation for improvement
26 I have the power to exert influence when other people are deciding what kind of person they will vote for in an election.	FQ/ .559	11%	"Power to exert influence" needs new translation. Item needs simplification overall. Reintroduce original future intent: "When I become an adult, I will be the kind of person who can. . ."
52 I am not able to decide things in groups.	SI/ .629	8%	Political confidence dimension reduced by loss of "influence decisions." Retain as social integration item; strengthen the social dimension, i.e.,"in my class we often decide things in groups."

Political confidence scale items (cont)

# Item	Factor/ loading	% No answer	Problem and recommendation for improvement
8 Even though it differs from most people's thinking, I can usually push through my way and persuade people.	Weak	11%	Translation of "get my way in groups" is poor and the behavior itself conflicts with good social conduct in Japan. Drop item.
43 When something is being decided, I sometimes take a leadership role.	FQ/ -.410	6%	Leadership behavior is problematic for Japanese youth. Being confident may mean not needing to lead. . .drop item.

Social integration scale items

# Item	Factor/ loading	% No answer	Problem and recommendation for improvement
9 Students in this class gradually get to know each other really well.	SI/ .321	4%	Meaningfulness may improve without "gradually."
28 The only people who are important to me are me and my family.	SI/ .316	4%	Translation of "the only" may be weak. Revise to state positively.
4 There are many students in this class that I don't want to be friends with.	SI/ .245	1%	Such a negative attitude may have prevented discriminating responses. Revise to state positively.

Political interest scale items

# Item	Factor/ loading	% No answer	Problem and recommendation for improvement
36 I think I would enjoy being involved in making decisions which affect my community.	FE/ .403	11%	Two dimensions: affective (enjoy involvement) and intended behavior (community involvement). Indication also that community involvement has little to do with politics in students mind. Drop item.

Political trust scale items

# Item	Factor/ loading	% No answer	Problem and recommendation for improvement
38 The government does not use taxpayers' money for useless purposes.	CYN/ .447	6%	Refine translation to improve meaning. "The government" may be vague.

Free expression scale items

# Item	Factor/ loading	% No answer	Problem and recommendation for improvement
49 Newspapers and magazines should be allowed to write anything they want.	Weak	5%	Without the phrase in the original item "except military secrets," the item lacks a clear dimension of free expression. Drop item.

Note. Abbreviations refer to factor-based scales: FE = Free expression; CYN = Cynicism towards authority; PI = Political interest; FC = Fear of censure; FQ = Foolish questions; SI = Social integration.

Appendix H: Rotated Factor Structures--Good Citizen Scale Items*

	1	2	3	4	5	6
GC15	**0.746**	0.112	0.314	-0.058	-0.045	0.041
GC8	**0.692**	-0.025	-0.077	0.051	-0.027	-0.323
GC16	**0.653**	-0.150	0.147	0.276	0.046	0.069
GC9	**0.640**	-0.066	-0.123	0.022	0.090	-0.042
GC14	**0.546**	0.046	0.169	-0.071	0.476	0.184
GC3	**0.519**	0.045	-0.187	0.273	0.228	0.158
GC6	0.014	**0.769**	0.080	0.010	0.083	0.186
GC4	-0.064	**0.719**	-0.060	0.107	0.042	-0.133
GC12	-0.023	0.258	**0.744**	-0.067	0.226	-0.071
GC10	0.120	-0.255	**0.617**	-0.021	0.130	-0.049
GC7	0.089	0.160	-0.188	**0.629**	0.102	0.168
GC18	0.312	0.188	0.068	**0.574**	-0.011	-0.326
GC17	0.079	-0.399	0.166	**0.502**	0.263	0.089
GC1	0.089	0.012	0.071	0.064	**0.845**	-0.042
GC13	0.021	0.040	0.181	0.445	**0.607**	-0.021
GC11	0.017	-0.038	0.068	-0.048	-0.002	**-0.843**
GC2	0.069	0.418	0.441	0.159	-0.189	0.330
GC5	0.280	0.068	-0.423	-0.382	0.356	0.013

*Boldface indicates those items which were included on factor-based scale

Percent of total variance explained by rotated components:

1	2	3	4	5	6
14.785	9.370	9.064	8.509	9.409	6.641

Table 1

Reliability Estimates for Eight a priori Scales of Political Attitudes

Scale	# Items	n[a]	Alpha	Spearman-Brown	M[b]	SD
Political interest	6	107	.79	.84	3.32	0.97
Free expression	7	104	.79	.76	2.57	0.85
Political trust	7	108	.71	.75	4.30	0.75
Political efficacy	8	82	.44	.62	3.40	0.58
Political confidence	5	111	.41	.39	3.57	0.75
Classroom climate	7	94	.41	.59	3.47	0.66
Social integration	8	119	.40	.33	2.71	0.62
Freedom from censure	6	98	.29	.45	3.97	0.61

[a]n reflects number of cases for which score could be calculated based on the presence of reponse data for all scale items. [b]Response options were on a scale of 1 - 6; the lower the mean score, the more positive the attitude.

Table 2

Reliability Estimates for Six Factor-based Scales of Political Attitudes

Factor	Scale	# Items	n[a]	Alpha	Spearman-Brown	M[b]	SD
1	Free expression	8	101	.84	.88	2.31	0.88
2	Cynicism towards authority	11	86	.81	.86	4.06	0.78
3	Political interest	5	112	.83	.80	3.30	1.08
4	Fear of censure	4	100	.49	.47	3.67	0.88
5	Foolish questions	5	113	.49	.53	2.32	0.77
6	Social integration	3	115	.38	.49	3.01	0.86

[a]n reflects number of cases for which score could be calculated based on the presence of reponse data for all scale items. [b]Response options were on a scale of 1 - 6; the lower the mean score, the more positive the attitude.

Table 3

Independent Sample t-test Comparisons on Free Expression Scale

Group	n[a]	M	SD	df	t[b]	p
Grade						
1	68	2.67	0.87	138	3.83	.01*
3	72	2.17	0.68			
School						
City	73	2.29	0.85	138	1.77	.08
Rural	67	2.54	0.76			
Sex						
Male	67	2.42	1.00	137	0.08	.94
Female	72	2.43	0.78			

Note. Response options 1 - 6; the lower the score, the more positive the attitude.

[a] n = 140 for grade and school comparisons; score missing for two cases and one case deleted because the score was an outlying value. n = 139 for sex comparison due to missing sex variable on one additional case. [b] t-statistic is based on the pooled variance for unequal cells.

* $p < .05$.

Table 4

Independent Sample t-test Comparisons on Cynicism Scale

Group	n[a]	M	SD	df	t[b]	p
Grade						
1	69	3.92	0.85	140	-0.89	.37
3	73	4.03	0.73			
School						
City	74	4.07	0.76	140	-1.46	.15
Rural	68	3.88	0.76			
Sex						
Male	68	4.07	1.00	138	-1.06	.29
Female	72	3.93	0.66			

Note. Response options 1 - 6; the lower the score, the more positive the attitude.

[a]n = 142 for grade and school comparisons; score missing for one case. n = 140 for comparison by sex; sex variable missing for three cases.

[b]t-statistic is based on the pooled variance for unequal cells.

Table 5

Independent Sample t-test Comparisons on Political Interest Scale

Group	n[a]	M	SD	df	t[b]	p
Grade						
1	68	3.64	1.16	139	2.67	.01*
3	73	3.14	1.05			
School						
City	73	3.33	1.11	139	0.59	.56
Rural	68	3.44	1.15			
Sex						
Male	67	3.22	1.19	137	1.67	.10
Female	72	3.54	1.06			

Note. Response options 1 - 6; the lower the score, the more positive the attitude.

[a]n = 141 for grade and school comparisons; score missing for two cases. n = 139 for comparison by sex; sex variable missing for two additional cases. [b]t-statistic is based on the pooled variance for unequal cells.

*p < .05.

Table 6

Reliability Estimates for Six Factor-based Scales of Attitudes Towards Good Citizen Behaviors

Factor	Scale	# Items	n[a]	Alpha	Spearman-Brownb	M[c]	SD
1	Active citizen	6	135	.73	.73	2.24	0.66
2	Non-political good citizen	2	142	.48	---	1.19	0.34
3	Indeterminate	2	141	.40	---	1.78	0.61
4	Indeterminate	3	142	.22	---	2.01	0.60
5	Disengaged good citizen	2	141	.58	---	1.64	0.63
6	Conformist citizen	1	141	---	---	2.92	0.48

[a]n reflects number of cases for which score could be calculated based on the presence of reponse data for all scale items. [b]Spearman Brown estimate unavailable for scales with less than four items. [c]Response options were on a scale of 1 - 4; the lower the mean score, the more positive the attitude.

Table 7

Independent Sample t-test Comparisons on Active Citizen Scale

Group	n[a]	M	SD	df	t[b]	p
Grade						
2	69	2.44	0.71	140	3.90	.01*
3	73	2.02	0.57			
School						
City	74	2.23	0.67	140	-0.09	.93
Rural	68	2.22	0.68			
Sex						
Male	68	2.20	0.60	138	0.17	.87
Female	72	2.22	0.72			

Note. Response options 1 - 4; the lower the score, the more positive the attitude.

[a]n = 142 for grade and school comparisons; score missing for one case. n = 140 for comparison by sex; sex variable missing for two additional cases. [b]t-statistic is based on the pooled variance for unequal cells.

*p < .05.

Table 8

Independent Sample t-test Comparisons on Participation Scale

Group	n[a]	M	SD	df	t[b]	p
Grade						
1	66	2.86	0.48	133	-.34	.74
3	69	2.88	0.45			
School						
City	73	2.90	0.44	133	-.84	.40
Rural	62	2.83	0.49			
Sex						
Male	67	2.78	0.48	131	2.10	.04*
Female	66	2.95	0.44			

Note. Response options 1 - 4; the lower the score, the more positive the attitude.

[a]n = 135 for grade and school comparisons; score missing for eight cases. n = 133 for comparison by sex; sex variable missing for two additional cases. [b]t-statistic is based on the pooled variance for unequal cells.

*p < .05.